This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AH
7779
19

AH 77.17.19

Harvard College
Library

VE RI
TAS

FROM THE BEQUEST OF
JOHN HARVEY TREAT
OF LAWRENCE, MASS.
CLASS OF 1862

THE EMPEROR JULIAN

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

THE EMPEROR JULIAN

AN ESSAY ON HIS RELATIONS WITH THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

BY

EDWARD J. MARTIN, B.D.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1919

105

AH 7779.19

HARVARD COLLEGE
MAR 17 1920
LIBRARY

Treat fund

PREFACE

SPEAKING of the Abbé de la Bleterie's Life of Julian, Voltaire denies the possibility of a priest writing history because "il faut être désinteressé sur tout et un prêtre ne l'est sur rien." Among most writers on Julian this saying of Voltaire has been an unconscious axiom. Zealous to avoid any appearance of Christian prejudice, biographers of Julian have fallen into the very fault they sought to escape, and, lest they should appear Christian partisans, they have made themselves apologists for paganism. The present essay is no more than an attempt to consider the facts, Christian as well as pagan.

The original authorities have been followed and balanced one against the other, and if most of the conclusions are the conclusions that other workers have already reached, they have at least the merit of being reached independently. For purposes of comparison many modern works have been consulted, but in no case have their theories or their facts been consciously borrowed. Two of

these must be mentioned, Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* and M. P. Allard's *Julien l'Apostat.* To commend Gibbon would be impertinence, but it is a fact worthy of notice that, in spite of his bias against Christianity, Gibbon's is still the fairest account of Julian in modern literature. M. Allard's book (perhaps a trifle severe on Julian) is a magnificent example of the historical method on a large scale. It is surprising, in the face of English versions of many far less important books on Julian, that this, the greatest, remains untranslated.

Secondly, this essay does not in any sense profess to give a complete account of Julian's life, for his military career, in which he displayed his greatest genius, is untouched. It is only a slight attempt to show the Holy Spirit's guidance of the Church under circumstances as unfavourable as any the Faith has had to face. At the same time (as Julian Johnson and Warburton felt in the 18th century) there is something very modern in these circumstances. Men still use the same old arguments, genuine and captious, that Julian used against Christianity. The problem of Education, secular and Christian, has altered only in detail since the Education Bills of Julian. Schemes of counter-Chris-

tianity still sue men's support, differing from Julian's scheme chiefly in that they lack a sponsor of his genius and enthusiasm. Some account of Julian should appeal to the Churchman as well as to the scholar, for the reason that his career is an unusually invigorating example of the truth that history is the cordial for drooping spirits.

In the third place, the man Julian himself affords a baffling problem in psychology. He is a figure sure to arouse admiration in most, and likely to startle a few. No plain satisfactory reason for his apostasy has been propounded, and when Signor Negri suggests that he was insane, he only shows to what a pass historians are driven. In many ways Julian was a simple kind of man, and we may have missed the key to his psychology just because he is so simple. His simplicity, like the simplicity of elemental comedy, sometimes tends to the grotesque; the writing of the *Misopogon*, the episode of the priest with the lonely goose to sacrifice, the Emperor's populous beard, the epithets applied to Athanasius, have a taste of Aristophanic buffoonery. The Emperor has been put finely in a play by Ibsen. One half expects to find him somewhere parodied by Mr. G. B. Shaw.

A great deal has been written about Julian from his own time onwards. There seems little justification for writing more, and yet there may be some who will read an essay when they would shirk a book; there may even be a few willing to congratulate themselves that against the Church of GOD, on one occasion at least, the opposition did not prevail.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 5

PART I

JULIAN AND CHRISTIANITY

§ 1. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE 4TH CENTURY . 11

§ 2. ANTI-CHRISTIAN INFLUENCES ON JULIAN . . 19

§ 3. JULIAN'S RELATIONS WITH CHRISTIANITY . . 27

§ 4. RESULTS OF JULIAN'S POLICY . . . 60

PART II

JULIAN'S SCHEME OF A RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

§ 1. THE APPROACH TO HELLENISM . . . 65

§ 2. JULIAN'S RELIGIOUS SCHEME: (a) Institutional . 69

§ 3. " " " (b) Historical . 79

§ 4. " " " (c) Philosophical 87

§ 5. THE FAILURE OF JULIAN'S SCHEME . . 98

§ 6. THE REASON OF THE FAILURE . . . 102

§ 7. JULIAN—THE MAN 109

APPENDICES

PAGE

JULIAN AS ADMINISTRATOR 112

A NOTE ON THE AUTHORITIES . . . 116

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY 120

CHRONOLOGY 124

INDEX 126

THE EMPEROR JULIAN

PART I

JULIAN AND CHRISTIANITY

§ I

RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE 4TH CENTURY

THE religious history of the early Christian centuries is chiefly remarkable outside the Church for the gradual disintegration of the official cult of the Empire. The old primitive religion survived among simple country people until quite late. But by A.D. 368 a law of Valentinian calls it—apparently without any note of satire—paganism, the faith of the villagers. The appeal which the cult of the Emperor made to popular sporting instinct through its games and displays, served too to prolong, at least in the West, the life even of this hollow development of the ancient religion. As late as 342 a law contained in the Theodosian Code, after declaring for the substitution of Christianity, goes on to re-

quire the maintenance of these enticing features of paganism.[1]

But among persons who really cared for religion—understanding by that term the relation between humanity and the powers of a higher, better, and greater life—the official religion was dead. Among the lower classes in the towns its place was taken by some of the theurgic religions of the East, which from the time of Pompey had been sweeping Westwards.[2] Among the simpler of the country people, the pagans proper, the old nature worship of the primitive cults had never disappeared. The more educated either professed open atheism, or made a religion of esoteric philosophy, and among all classes and in all districts Christianity was gradually superseding every other form of faith.

In the Eastern part of the Empire paganism, where it existed, often took a theurgic form, inspired by the Neo-Platonists of

[1] Quamquam omnis superstitio penitus sit eruenda, tamen volumus ut aedes templorum quae extra muros sunt positae intactae incorruptaeque consistant. Nam cum ex nonnullis vel ludorum vel circensium vel agonum origo fuerit exorta, non convenit ea convelli ex quibus populo Romano praebeatur priscarum solennitas voluptatum. (Cod. Theod., xvi.10.3.)

[2] Cf. almost any of the Latin poets from the classical period and later writers like Lucian.

Alexandria who had sought by philosophy to infuse a new life into religion. As taught by Ammonius and Porphyry, Neo-Platonism was a high mysticism, the endeavour after a direct apprehension of the divine essence; but with Iamblichus lower theurgical elements had come in, with fanciful esoteric doctrines, which made religion less spiritual than spiritualistic. The mystical cults of the East, of which Mithraism was the most successful, made no profession of philosophy, but, founded as they claimed to be on revelation, gave free scope to theurgy; they had at least this to their credit, that they appealed to the imagination in a way that no other pagan cult could be said to do. But all the cults had the common feature of a morality always low and often deliberately debauched.[1] Nor apparently were the attempts of Constantine and his successors entirely effective in uprooting this paganism.

Less effective still were they in the West, where the old official Roman religion had remained obstinately fixed because it was more in accordance with the national religions of the peoples. Temples had remained open, and pagan festivals were observed, in spite of the decrees of Constantius and Con-

[1] Cf. gems and amulets with indecent figures.

stans forbidding pagan sacrifices on pain of death, and ordering the closure of all temples.[1] So that St. Augustine can describe the city of Rome as a city of idol-worshippers.[2] Even in Africa, the most Christian province of the Empire, if St. Augustine's epistles are to be credited, paganism was strong enough to make the law powerless.[3] Gaul, where significantly enough Julian made his open profession of apostasy, was almost entirely pagan, and Britain was outside the ordinary channels of Christian influence. A German writer, Mucke,[4] has said that at this time paganism was the living faith of one half of the Roman Empire, and the statement is more accurate than it appears. For though in the East there were only outposts of paganism such as Philistia, Phœnicia, Damas, and Berytus, and though the large towns were, both in East and West, markedly Christian, yet there were huge stretches of country all but untouched by Christianity, and probably nowhere, except in Constanti-

[1] Cod. Theod., XVI.10.6. Cf. XVI.10.3.

[2] Venerator idolorum sacrorumque sacrilegorum particeps, quibus tunc fere tota Romana nobilitas spectabat. Aug., *Conf.*, VIII. 2. Cf. Gregorovius, *History of City of Rome.*

[3] Aug., *Epp.*, 16, 17, 91.

[4] J. F. A. Mucke, *Flavius Claudius Julianus nach den Quellen.*

nople itself, was the Christian government strong enough to enforce its anti-pagan legislation.

Christianity, on the other hand, strong as it had become, often found its strength a source of weakness. "The headstrong wickedness of the many," says Gregory Nazianzen, "gave Julian power against us as also did the extreme prosperity of the Christians, with the corresponding changes it must often have wrought, the possession of power and honour, and the daring insolence naturally resulting therefrom."[1] The struggles of Arianism and the secessions of the Donatists must have sapped the energies of the Church and weakened its spiritual forces. A nominal Christianity dominated the East; Constantinople had not so much as a pagan altar, unless it were in a museum; wherever Julian goes among the towns of the East it is to find broken altars and neglected shrines. Such pagans as survived were for the most part men like Ammianus Marcellinus or Candidianus of Cappadocia,[2] whose paganism was devoid of theological animus, even, one may say, lacking in strong conviction. But

[1] Quoted in Neander, *Julian*, p. 119. Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.31.

[2] Gregory Naz., *Ep.*, 10.

the Christian Faith itself had suffered. The influences of Platonism and of the Mysteries had in a degree developed its philosophy—in itself no bad thing. But Arianism had introduced an element destructive of its other worldliness. The patronage of emperors had brought into the Church men like Lampadius, or Olybrius, or Petronius Probus, whose morals and display were hardly consistent with the Christian ideal they professed.[1] The disappearance of the middle classes, which all writers notice as a sinister feature of the period, reacted adversely on Christianity, depriving the Church of the body of men which has always been its strongest and most reliable bulwark. The bishops rose to an importance which might easily have been harmful to the best interests of their flocks. Under Constantine they were constituted as a supreme court of civil justice, from which there was no appeal.[2] More than that, they were entrusted with powers of wardship over orphans, and in many small ways their influence was officially recognized. The poor, the widows, and the incompetent in general were not merely in theory, but in practice, under their protection.[3] The bishop was in

[1] Amm. Marc., *passim*. [2] Cod. Theod., 1.27.1.
[3] Concil. Sardicae Canon., 7 9.

fact the official arbitrator in all difficult questions and the protector of all who could not protect themselves. It is unnecessary to enlarge on the power and even popularity that must have followed the careful performance of such duties. The ranks of the clergy were strengthened, at least in theory, by a law of 360 which exempted all in priests' orders from curial office.[1] But, as this became an inducement to unscrupulous persons to seek the priesthood to escape their civil duties, it became necessary by a counter law to confine the priesthood to men below curial rank.[2]

The strongest feature of Christianity at the time was one which has only been inadequately appreciated—the enormous number of women included in the Church. Julian himself with a sneer tells the Antiochenes in the *Misopogon* that they permit their wives to carry everything to the Galilæans.[3] Particularly among the aristocracy, as the evidence of the cemeteries shows, the women who were not Christian must have been greatly in the minority. The influence of women was infinitely greater (as it is still) on the events and temper of the world than

[1] Cod. Theod., XVI.2.15. [2] Cod. Theod., XVI.2.3.
[3] Jul., *Misop.*, 363A.

is perhaps commonly supposed, and from his angry sarcasms against Antioch it almost looks as if Julian himself foresaw that his anti-Christian policy failed, not least, because he had not thought it worth his while to secure the interest and co-operation of women.

Such was the state of the Empire when Julian became an actor in its drama. The East was permeated with a Christianity which had lost its early glow, its early enthusiasm and its first purity; but it was a powerful Christianity from the worldly point of view, and its roots went deeper than Julian guessed. The West had retained much of its original paganism, with strong outposts of Christianity, especially in Africa and in Spain. It is a strange example of the irony of history that in the West, where there was a large probability of success, Julian made little attempt to push his schemes; in the East, where circumstances were so strongly against him, he made his attempt and achieved his failure.[1]

[1] But Julian was hardly fitted to carry out a pagan revival in the West. He was an Oriental by birth, endowment, and education; his language was Greek (Eutropius, x.16.3); he knew no Latin before 354–5. The East, moreover, was the key to the position. Even with a Western Empire converted to paganism, the Emperor would have still had the East to face, and the East would have

§ 2

INFLUENCES CALCULATED TO PROMOTE THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN ELEMENT IN JULIAN

IN the elements which made up the life of the fourth century there was nothing to make a predisposition towards paganism unlikely, and in the case of Julian there were causes, purely personal indeed, but for that very reason all the more obstinate. The Christianity of Constantinople was devoid of moral worth; the Christianity of Asia was largely Arian and wholly unimaginative. Attempts have been made to lay upon the semi-Arian bishop, Eusebius of Nicomedeia, the onus of responsibility for Julian's apostasy, the suggestion being that his version of Christianity was too hard and dry for the youthful scholar. On the other hand, Rode goes so far as to say that Julian saw how far the Nicene theology had departed from the primi-

welcomed him even less than it did, if he had come as the champion of a reform admittedly Western.

For the cold worldliness of the Christianity of the period compare the verses of Ausonius later in the century. In his somewhat voluminous writings there is practically nothing (except obscenity) which could annoy the sternest pagan.

tive teaching of Christ.[1] But this is more than questionable. Metaphysical development in itself was a thing that appealed to Julian. His own system was full of the principle, and if Julian does suggest that the Christian Church had advanced from the simple standards of its Founder, the argument was an afterthought. The study of Julian's mind points to the conclusion that he became a pagan first, and sought for arguments to justify his position afterwards.

The strongest predisposing cause of his apostasy was his personal enmity to the house of Constantine. Up to 355 (the probable year of his nomination as Cæsar) Julian was nursing hatred for his cousin, the emperor Constantius, whom he regarded as the murderer, not only of his father and uncles, but also of his brother Gallus. The three laudatory orations on Constantius and Eusebia, which Julian composed between 355 and 357, are mere rhetoric, devoid alike of sincerity and spontaneity, and the true feeling that Julian entertained for his cousin is reflected in the slighting attitude to Constantius which is to be found in the pages of Libanius.

This attitude to the man promoted a corresponding attitude to the Christianity

[1] Rode, F., *Geschichte der Reaktion Kaiser Julian.*

of which Constantius was the foremost patron, and the character of Julian himself went far to encourage his not very liberal views. According to Gregory of Nazianzus, who was his companion at Athens University, Julian was a man of neurotic temperament, inconsistent and excitable in his behaviour.[1] His nervousness even Libanius acknowledges,[2] while Gregory declares that, even at the time, he could not but notice how the character of the man was displayed in his physical appearance, the loose-hung neck, twitching shoulders, rolling eyes, a laugh uncontrollable and spasmodic, a spluttering speech and an inability to stand or sit without fidgeting with his feet.[3] His soul was heroic but unreasonable, and he lacked that *epieikeia* which to the Greeks was the first of virtues. His undignified behaviour at Antioch in 363, when he delivered himself of the *Misopogon*, is a signal evidence of a lack of balance in his character. The death of his mother Basilina, when he was only a few months old, must in itself have had an adverse effect on him,[4] and the years of solitary confinement, first

[1] τὸ περιττὸν τῆς ἐκστάσεως: Greg. Naz., *Or.*, v.23.
[2] Libanius, *Fun. Or.*, ed. Reiske, 536.
[3] Greg. Naz., *l.c.*
[4] Jul., *Misop.*, 352B.

at Macellum (343–351), and then at Nicomedeia (352–355)—the former culminating in the death of Gallus—were bound to embitter the already morbid mind of the youth, and would feed his hatred without giving him the healthy outlook that practical experience might have supplied.

Here, then, was a youth by character and by accident of condition predisposed against anything that could be associated with Constantius. It so happened that the most important factor in the career of Constantius was the Christian religion. It was for this reason that Julian approached the Christian religion with a predisposition to hostility. The accident of his education increased that bent of his mind. Eusebius, the bishop of Nicomedeia, his earliest tutor and apparently a kinsman, could have given him little attention. Even in the fourth century, bishops had no time to spend on little boys. He fell entirely therefore into the hands of Mardonius, a Scythian eunuch, and an old servant of the family. This man, though not a Christian, was a pagan Puritan, a martinet, who hated all relaxation, and balanced a complete ignorance of Latin by a devotion to Homer and Greek literature so intense as to be a kind of religion. Julian can look back

to him with affection,[1] although the effect of his teaching must have been to dry up the softer unction of the boy's character, and to make him less human than a boy should be, thanks to his substitution of readings from Theophrastus and Plato[2] for the pantomime, the dance, and the horse-race. When such a training was given to a boy, not yet thirteen, it is small wonder that the boy grew into a hard, self-contained, unloving, if able, man.

Afterwards, at Macellum, the lad apparently came under Christian influence; his character however was partly formed, and when he came to attend classes at the universities of Athens and Nicomedeia, there was nothing to attract him anew to Christianity. Nicocles,[3] his teacher of Grammar, seems to have been a person of little weight, and Hecebolius, his teacher of Rhetoric, was the Vicar of Bray of the period, a man without stability or influence. Transferred to Nicomedeia, Julian was forbidden to enter for the classes of the pagan sophist Libanius, but he contrived to read the lectures each day, and thus fell under the influence of one who never deserted him, and eventually became his

[1] Jul., *Or.*, VIII. 241D, *Misop.*, 352.
[2] Jul., *Misop.*, 351. [3] Socrates, III. 1.

most profuse and sincere panegyrist. At the same time and in the same place he came into touch with Maximus of Ephesus, the one man who, individually, was most influential in securing his actual apostasy, though, no doubt, in this he was merely the instrumental cause, bringing together the converging influences of the past. Maximus would have called himself a disciple of Neo-Platonism, a system of which Julian already knew at least the elements. In its original form, Neo-Platonism was almost a pagan mysticism, on a Platonic foundation. In the course of its development, it lost most of its original form under theurgic accretions, until it ceased to be a systematic philosophy altogether, and became a religion which paid no attention to intellectual apprehension, and sought intuitive knowledge of the supernatural by methods hardly different from those of the modern Spiritualist. Its inspiration in its more developed period came from Eastern sources: Chaldæa,[1] Phœnicia,[2] and Persian Mithraism.[3] As expounded by its earlier professors it had been eclectic and tolerant,[4] and following that tendency, in

[1] Jul., *Or.*, v., *Mother of Gods*, 172D.
[2] Jul., *Or.*, IV., *Sovereign Sun*, 134A. [3] Jul., *l.c.*, 155B.
[4] See Porphyry *ad Marcell.* He practically gives the phrase κατὰ τὰ πάτρια="Follow local customs," as a description of Neo-Platonic principles.

the hands of Iamblichus it deteriorated into a syncretic Oriental religion with an immense element of pure magic. Its essential value remained in its emphasis on the spiritual view of life and it was this that appealed to the sense of mystery and wonder which in Julian's early teaching had been neglected and distorted. For he had learnt nothing of the æsthetic side of Christianity, though apparently baptized and holding the minor office of reader in the church. Thus it was the magic, that is the spiritual, element and not the philosophy that attracted him. Ammianus Marcellinus aptly sums up his religious character when he says that his piety inclined to superstition.[1] Though Maximus of Ephesus seems to have been little more than a medium, yet as such he was one of the foremost figures of his day. He fascinated Julian and under his influence Julian made his final renunciation of Christianity. "I bless that day," says Libanius, "as the commencement of the world's freedom and that place (Nicomedeia) and that physician of the soul"[2] (Maximus).

It has been urged by some writers that a

[1] Superstitiosus magis quam sacrorum legitimus observator. Amm. Marc., XXV.4.17.

[2] Libanius, 376.

considerable influence on Julian's apostasy was exerted by the prefect Sallustius. This man was something of a philosopher, having written (about the year 360) a work on Neo-Platonic lines, entitled, *On the Gods and the World.* In some ways it is similar to Julian's essay on king Helios, written in 362, a connection which is emphasized by the fact that Julian dedicates his work to Sallustius. Julian first met him in Gaul in 356 and quickly found him to be a congenial spirit.[1] In 357 Sallustius was recalled and Julian addressed to him a consolatory letter.[2] The second panegyric on Constantius belonging to the same year (357) is markedly pagan in expression, and it may well be the case that the sympathetic influence of Sallustius was the last incentive to Julian's apostasy. There is no reason to suppose with Gibbon that there is more than one Sallustius. No doubt it was the same man who counselled a moderate policy against Christianity in Asia,[3] and was offered the purple at Julian's death. The encouragement of Sallustius probably did no more than finish the work of many

[1] Libanius, 543. [2] Jul., *Or.*, VIII.

[3] Soc., III.19. The moderate spirit shown by Sallustius is well in keeping with the tolerance of the Neo-Platonists (cf. Porphyry), a tolerance which Julian in some way lost. See page 24, note 4.

years. So long as Constantius lived, however, Julian could not safely declare himself, and it was not therefore until 360, when he was himself proclaimed Emperor at Paris, that he was in a secure position to make a public declaration of his change of religion.

§ 3

THE RELATIONS OF JULIAN WITH CHRISTIANITY

JULIAN had continued to make at least some outward profession of Christianity until the death of Constantius.[1] Apparently he had been an active Christian up to the time of his association with Maximus (351–2), for he is credited with helping his brother Gallus to raise a shrine to St. Mammas in Cappadocia,[2] and there is no reason to doubt that he was ordained to the minor office of reader in the Church. As late as 361 he celebrated the festival of the Epiphany.[3] Miss Gardner has made the startling suggestion that Julian was never baptized, on the grounds that Constantine's house, following the example of their ancestor, only sought baptism *in*

[1] Jul., *Ep.*, 51. [2] Sozomen, v.2.
[3] Amm. Marc., XXI.2. But I shall suggest an explanation of this later.

extremis. But apart from the fact that an unbaptized person could not well have held office in the Church, there is a final argument to be found in the fact, related by Sozomen and Gregory,[1] that Julian sought by the Taurobolium and other expiatory rites to wash away from his body the traces of baptism, and especially from his hands the sacred touch of the Eucharist.

The years 351–2 may be taken as the period of his definite intellectual rejection of Christianity, and Gregory even claims to have seen signs of that change much earlier.[2] He concealed his personal opinions at first, whether from mental hesitation, or from lack of opportunity, until his removal to Gaul. There in a pagan environment,[3] and in the congenial companionship of Sallustius, he was encouraged to take a decisive step, and in 361[4] he was able to make a tentative restoration of public sacrifices; the last bond with Christianity was broken. In that year it is true he celebrated the Epiphany, but what Ammianus really says is, that at the Epiphany

[1] Soz., v.2. Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.52. It is extremely unlikely that an unbaptized person would ever be admitted to Communion even though he were a royal prince of an Arian Church.

[2] Greg. Naz., *Or.* v.23.

[3] See above, p. 26.

[4] Jul., *Ep.*, 38.

Julian entered the Christian Church at Vienne, and after prayer departed.[1] As, later, he identified the feast of the Great Mother with the Annunciation on March 25, so, now, it was probably not Christmas that was in his mind, but the feast of Sol Invictus.

The dealings of Julian with Christianity may be classed roughly into: (*a*) Arguments against Christianity; (*b*) Administrative methods against Christians; (*c*) Individual enactments against them; while the tenor of Julian's method may be gathered from pictures of his dealings (1) with towns and (2) with persons. The counter movement for establishing a rival religion must be treated separately.

(*a*) Julian's intellectual attitude to Christianity was not the humility of the agnostic who finds too much in Christianity to reconcile with his reason; it was rather the theurgist's impatience of an historical basis of the faith, too human, too commonplace, and too low for the higher flights of fancy. The miracles of Christianity are not miraculous enough for him. Whenever Julian uses the arguments of the rationalist, it must be remembered that his ideal was as far from rationalism as it was possible to be; he was

[1] Numine orato discessit, Amm. Marc., XXI.2.5.

essentially a spiritualist and many of his arguments against Christianity were in principle as damaging to his own case as to his enemies'. Whether Julian is delivering a new attack on Christianity, or, as is commonly supposed, only restating Porphyry's old one, he does not appear, in the fragments of his book that survive, to be a really dangerous antagonist. Unfortunately his book against the Christians, written at Antioch just before his death (Jan. or Feb., 363), has disappeared, except so far as parts of it survive in the Refutation of Cyril. It was also refuted by Apollinarius in the 4th century, by Theodore of Mopsuestia later in the same century, and by Philip of Side in the 5th century: neither Gregory nor Basil have any mention of it. In the West, pagan as that region was, it received little or no attention, probably because metaphysical argument made less impression on Western minds. So that Jerome only mentions the work in a letter to Magnus, to say that if he did undertake to answer the arguments, his correspondent would not approve.[1]

So far as can be gathered from the fragments preserved by Cyril, Julian's book was concerned entirely with the Bible. The first

[1] Jerome, *Ep.*, 70.

section (which is largely intact in Cyril's quotations) dealt with the Old Testament; the second, of which we have only a few sentences, apparently criticized the Gospels; of the third, dealing with the rest of the New Testament, nothing survives. It is a criticism of the Bible rather than of the ideas of Christianity. The main line of argument seems to be that the Christian God is only the national god of the Jews, and, as such, a weak and inferior deity, whose very weakness and inferiority is worthily reproduced in the slaves and maidservants whom Christianity has attracted to its ranks. The same weakness is found in Jesus Christ Himself, for "he who commanded spirits, who walked on the sea and expelled demons, and (as you say) made the heaven and the earth . . . could not change the deliberate choice of his friends and kindred to their own salvation."[1] He sneers at the simplicity of the Christian belief in the efficacy of baptism. "It does not indeed take away the spots of leprosy, nor the gout, nor the dysentery, nor the dropsy, nor any small or great defect of the body, but it can take away adultery, rapine, and in short all the crimes of the soul."[2]

[1] Julian, *Against Christians* (Eng. trans. anon. ed. by Willis Nevins, 1873), p. 41. [2] *l.c.*, 49.

The prophecies concerning Christ are only so much rubbish, for how is it possible to refer to Him the words of Genesis, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah," when according to the Christian creed, "he was not born of Joseph but of the Holy Spirit?"[1] Besides, in this connection, the discordant genealogies of Matthew and Luke are in self-evident contradiction.

All the arguments against Christianity that survive are of this type of literary criticism. Continuing on this line, Julian accuses St. John of having fabricated the Divinity of our Lord, a belief of which he claims that St. Paul, St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke were all ignorant.[2] Unfortunately no reference to our Lord's Resurrection survives nor any exposition of His character. The arguments indeed are all of an *a priori* type which suggests that they only came into Julian's mind after he had apostatized, and was looking for materials for his book, or else that he had got his Christianity only from a study of the Bible, without having learnt its spiritual ideas, or its idea of the Church. But that he was really ignorant of these ideas is disproved by his consistent borrowing from them in the construction of

[1] *l.c.*, 51. [2] *l.c.*, 62.

his own pagan church. There seem to be no comments on the historic personality of our Lord, possibly because a lack of historical sense was characteristic of Julian's mind, and verbal criticism reaches its lowest level in his remarks on sepulchres, which run something like this: The Christians show respect for the tombs of the dead; now this is inconsistent with their own Master's warning, that sepulchres are full of all uncleanness,[1] and His reflection, on another occasion, that it behoved the dead to bury the dead.[2] There is, he adds, a reason: the real object of tombs is divination, as witness their own prophet Isaiah, "They sleep in sepulchres and caves on account of dreams."[3] And yet Christians despise divination. Could any argument be less convincing? The very childishness of it is apt to discredit either Julian's sincerity or his intelligence.

His criticism of the Old Testament follows similar lines. He opens with a Platonic objection to the Creation story, on the ground that God, being Himself immortal and incorporeal, could, as such, only create things of a nature like His own.[4] There follow a number of conundrums, many of which have sur-

[1] St. Matt. XXIII. 27.
[2] St. Matt. VIII. 21.
[3] Isa. LXV. 4. Jul., *l.c.*, 65.
[4] Jul., *l.c.*, 9.

vived to our own day. Why did not God know that Eve would ruin Adam? How could the serpent talk? If God is the God of the whole world, why did He fasten His affections on the Jews? Why is He a jealous God, if He is perfect good? What intelligent meaning is there in the story of Babel? Why is God so often fiercely enraged? The final argument is that moral commandments are not confined to the Jews, so that it is foolish to speak of Jehovah, a national God, as the only source of good.[1] Julian concludes his section on the Old Testament by admitting an admiration for Abraham and his God, on the grounds that he was a theurgist, and acknowledged the supreme value of sacrifice.[2]

The treatment of the Babel narrative is typical of Julian's method. He takes the words, "Let us go down and confound their speech," and draws the very reasonable and modern conclusion that here is a reminiscence of original polytheism; he compares with Babel the episode of the Aloidæ,[3] but then he goes on to make the worthless comment that all the earth could not contain enough

[1] *l.c., passim.* [2] *l.c.*, 71.

[3] *Iliad*, v.315. This is a real mark of interest in comparative religion.

bricks to reach to heaven. He follows this up with some unimaginative criticism of the word "descend"—that God must have been very weak, if He could not work from heaven, but had to come down to the earth itself; and he concludes with the complaint that, though this story may explain the variety of the languages of the earth, it throws no light on the differences of national customs.

The Book against Christianity is a mixture of real and superficial objections to points of detail, often of very unimportant detail. It may be unreasonable to expect a scientific theory of religion in the fourth century, yet, earlier than this, Tertullian could see the underlying unity of all religions in the *anima naturaliter Christiana*, and so small a man as Justin Martyr could recognize the essential resemblance of Mithraism to the Christian ideals of forgiveness and expiation. But Julian ridicules the Christian Scriptures without seeking to discover the essential things which belong to all religions. It is a comment on his inability to reach correct conclusions, or his invincible prejudice against Christianity, that he singles out for admiration from the whole Bible the idea that Abraham was some sort of theurgic buffoon.

Whether his arguments are original or borrowed, and borrowed many of them certainly are, in any case, as it stands, this book is rather a disingenuous work, which throws little light on his motives for apostasy. Its defect, from the side of criticism, is that it fails to distinguish the important from the unimportant. There is, however, a saving fact; it is scarcely fair to form an absolutely definite opinion on a work which exists only in fragments. Even these fragments are by no means without merits as a criticism of the Bible, though it is the criticism of one who has read without discernment. Where it fails is in attacking the Bible and not the Christian Faith. What impression the book made on contemporary readers, it is hard to say. In the East it was thought worthy of at least three or four Refutations. In the West it was ignored. It soon disappeared, whether through the malignant hatred of the Christians who suppressed it, or because of a failure to hit the mark, which doomed it to oblivion.

(*b*) Julian appears even less favourably in his personal dealings with the Christians themselves. Gibbon, with his usual force of language, says, "His pity was degraded by contempt: his contempt was embittered by

hatred." It is commonly acknowledged that there was no active persecution for Christian profession *per se*.[1]

He lays down his policy at the beginning of his reign as a policy of pagan preference, without unjust persecution,[2]—a policy which as the events showed was not without an element of savage irony. In fact it was what St. Jerome calls a mild persecution of enticement.[3] Even the Christian critics of his policy absolve him from the title of persecutor in the sense the word is applied to a Decius or a Diocletian. "He grudged the glory of martyrdom," says Gregory.[4] "He accounted the compulsion . . . of unwilling worshippers ill advised," says Sozomen.[5] Libanius is literally accurate when he says, "Disapproving therefore of such measures, and seeing that the strength of the other party had been augmented by their slaughter, he avoided what he blamed in others, and such as were susceptible of being reformed he led into the

[1] Jul., *Or.*, II. 89B.

Julian sums up his method in one of his own speeches: *τοὺς μὲν ἀγαθοὺς τιμήσει προθύμως, τοὺς μοχθηροὺς δὲ εἰς δύναμιν ἰᾶσθαι καθάπερ ἰατρὸς ἀγαθὸς προθυμήσεται.*

[2] *Ibid. Ep.*, 7. *Ἐγώ, μὰ τοὺς θεούς, οὔτε κτείνεσθαι τοὺς Γαλιλαίους, οὔτε τύπτεσθαι παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον, . . . προτιμᾶσθαι μέντοι τοὺς θεοσσεβεῖς, καὶ πάνυ φημὶ δεῖν.*

[3] Jer., *Transl. Eusebii Chronicorum*, 503, 4. Blanda persecutio illiciens magis quam impellans ad sacrificandum.

[4] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, XXI.32. [5] Soz., V.15.8.

Truth, while those that preferred the worse part he did not drag there."[1] But to say that Julian was no persecutor, because he did not cry, "Out sword and slay," is to misinterpret history. When Gregory says, "He was ashamed to use force like a tyrant," one of the whitewashers of Julian remarks that "by this unguarded admission the preacher refutes his whole invective."[2] A sufficient comment on that is the appeal of Libanius to the gods asking, "Did he not wage war on them who warred against you?"[3] and the remark of Julian quoted by Gregory, "Let not the Christians be persecuted, but let them suffer whatever their persecutors think fit."[4]

If Julian did not persecute Christians, he did persecute Christianity. One of the first acts of his reign was to recall all banished heretics, an action in which Gibbon sees a desire to promote internal disruption in the Christian camp. The Donatists celebrated the Apostate as the "one man who had allowed Justice to triumph."[5] The return of the Arians led among other events to the vindictive treatment of Athanasius,[6] and Ammianus

[1] Libanius, 564.
[2] C. W. King, the translator in the Bohn series.
[3] Libanius, 617. [4] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.94.
[5] Optatus, *de schism. Don.*, II.16. [6] See p. 54.

states explicitly that Julian had hoped to encourage general dissension,[1] but, with one or two notable exceptions, his hopes were disappointed.[2] In certain cases also Julian departed so far from his professed clemency, as to show favour to some of the recalled Arian bishops, who had found their sees occupied, notably Aetius, an old friend,[3] to whom he gave the privileges of the public post, and, according to Philostorgius, an estate in Lesbos;[4] and, if the fragment of a letter is to be accepted, he showed equal honour to the heretic Photinus.[5] At the same time, he deprived the other bishops of the privilege of free passes on the public post,[6] which they had been accorded by Constantine.[7] The clergy he compelled to undertake curial duty, from which hitherto they had been exempted;[8] both these acts, however, may well have been part of a necessary administrative reform, and indeed the exemption of the clergy from the *curiae* had long been an abuse.[9]

More serious interference with Christians followed. In accordance with his proposed

[1] Amm. Marc., XXI.5.4.
[2] See p. 52.
[3] *Ep.*, 31.
[4] Phil., IX.4.
[5] Frag. no. 79.
[6] Cod. Theod., VIII.5.12.
[7] Euseb., *vit. Const.*, III.6.
[8] Amm. Marc., XXII.9.
[9] See p. 17.

policy, the Emperor restricted[1] the magistracy to pagans, for the ironical and disingenuous reason, which carried more injustice than the act itself, that Christians were prohibited by their faith from the use of force,[2] whilst the army was restored to paganism by a combined pressure of policy and gifts.[3] Policy meant this—in the camps, by the side of the Emperor's statue, were placed images of the gods, so that when the soldier, as in duty bound, made his reverence to the Emperor's statue, he also was held to have done obeisance to the gods, and by this trick many simple souls were ensnared. The prætorian guards were made entirely pagan, and the Labarum was abolished. Gregory speaks of the defilement of churches in Cappadocia, but this may be received with reserve, for lack of confirmation. There is no reason, however, to doubt that, in Antioch and elsewhere, the tombs of martyrs, and relics, including those of St. John Baptist and Elisha, were ruthlessly destroyed, for Julian himself admits it.[4] In Antioch indeed Julian reached the lowest level of vindictiveness. According to

[1] Jul., *Ep.*, 7—*προτιμᾶσθαι μέντοι τοὺς θεοσσεβεῖς καὶ πάνυ φημὶ δεῖν.* [2] Socr., III.13.

[3] Libanius, 578—*οὐκ ἀρκούντων δὲ τῶν λογῶν, χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος συνέπραττεν εἰς πείθω.*

[4] Jul., *Misop.*, 361A.

Theodoret, he ordered the provisions in the market to be sprinkled with lustral water to make them unfit for pious Christians, and he cast idols into the public fountains.[1] He certainly withdrew from the bishops their right of judicature,[2] he even required widows and virgins to refund the provision which had been made for them from public sources;[3] the revenues of the Church from the public purse he had withdrawn already. Socrates states that he imposed a war tax on those who would not sacrifice,[4] but he is probably only thinking of the case of Cæsarea.[5] The last word in petty annoyances was a law which gave to Christians the official title of Galilæans.[6] Neander adds that he also deprived the Church of the power of receiving legacies, but he is probably misinterpreting the withdrawal of public revenue, for there seems to be no authority for his actual statement.[7]

The rebuilding of pagan temples destroyed by Christians which he ordered at the beginning of his reign was not in itself unreasonable, and in expelling the eunuchs of the

[1] Theod., III.15.
[2] Jul., *Ep.*, 52.
[3] Soz., V.5.
[4] Socr., III.3.
[5] Soz., V.4. See p. 51.
[6] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.76.
[7] Neander, A., *The Emperor Julian and his Friends*, Eng. trans., p. 129.

court he was apparently actuated by motives not of pagan intolerance, but of economy. Gibbon seems to be without authority for saying that he transferred the Christian tithes to pagan priests; he took them from the Christians, but it was only indirectly that he used them for the maintenance of paganism. The official observance of Sunday was discontinued, and daylight funerals were forbidden; in the later regulation there may have been no more than a desire to prevent riots,[1] though M. Cumont sees here the influence of Mithraism, which hated the defilement of the corpse, and certainly Julian supports his enactment with the claim that the "purity of the day must be reserved for pure works and the gods of Olympus."[2] Gregory goes so far as to allege that freedom of speech, and even the right of pleading in the courts, were withdrawn from all Christians, because every public speaker was required to burn a few grains of incense before commencing his oration.[3] This is indirectly refuted by Ammianus, who notices that Julian was in the habit of enquiring after each man's religion as soon as he stood up to plead in court,[4] and religious opinion was not allowed

[1] Jul., *Ep.*, 77.
[2] Jul., *l.c.*
[3] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.96.
[4] Amm. Marc., XXII.10.2.

to interfere with any one's right to justice.[1]

But if in these latter cases an injustice seems to be done to Julian, his educational policy shows him in the worst possible light. Education, particularly in the East, was well advanced. Every town had its professed teachers of Grammar and Rhetoric, forming a kind of University College, which in the larger centres was actually a University. Although any private person might be a professor of some branch of learning, the private teacher had little chance, unless he was a man of exceptional power, and in most cases the schools were endowed either by the town finances or, more rarely, out of the Imperial revenues. The text-books used were classical and pagan—Homer, Demosthenes, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Vergil—but they were studied as classics and not as apostles of paganism, any more than they are studied as handbooks of religion in our public schools to-day. Julian's first decree, dated May 12th, 362, was a colourless confirmation of all existing privileges to teachers.[2] This was followed a month later, June 17th,

[1] Nec argui unquam potuit ob religionem vel quodcunque aliud ab aequitatis recto tramite deviasse. (Amm. Marc., *l.c.*)

[2] Theod. Cod., XIII.3.4.

362, by a decree with an ominous preamble: "In the case of scholastic teachers and professors, character should carry more weight than academic ability. As I cannot make a personal inspection of every township, I order that intending teachers should refrain from a reckless or hurried assumption of that career; each candidate must be subjected to an orderly examination, and accepted by decree of the municipal council, with the assent of the gentry, and such decree must be submitted to me for personal approval. I take this step to ensure greater respect for those who undertake the task of public education."[1]

The reference to character in the opening sentence was undoubtedly directed against Christianity, and the "gentry" (*optimi*) whose assent was required to any appointment almost as certainly meant the pagan nobility. But if the Emperor's object was to cripple the influence of Christianity in the schools, this decree would take a long time to produce that result. For it did not interfere with those already occupying professorial chairs, it did not restrict the rights of the municipal councils to fill such vacancies as occurred, nor could it touch the class

[1] Theod. Cod., XIII.3.5.

of unofficial professors of the type of Libanius.

The decree of the 17th of June proved, however, to be only a preliminary to Julian's real intention, expressed in a rescript, belonging probably to the last months of the same year. Its character and its temper mark it as a production of the time of his stay in Antioch, when the clemency and tolerance of his earlier manner had given way to bitterness and something like violence. The rescript, which is preserved among Julian's letters,[1] lays down that, for the future, all who are engaged in public education must be steeped in the only doctrines which conduce to the safety of the State. Whoever thinks one thing, and teaches another, falls short from an educational, no less than from a moral, standard. Teachers, whose textbooks are Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, and Lysias cannot be expected to expound their authors correctly, if they dishonour the gods those authors served. "If they acknowledge," he concludes, "the wisdom of those, whose writings they interpret, and whose prophets, as it were, they are, let them first of all imitate their piety towards the gods. But

[1] No. 42.

if they feel that these have gone astray concerning the gods, the most adorable, then let them go to the churches of the Galilæans, and expound Matthew and Luke, in obedience to whom ye are bidden to abstain from holy rites. . . . None that desire to *attend* lectures are debarred. . . . Fools are better taught than punished." The sneers of the partisan fall ill from the lips of the statesman. The argument is illogical. Why should the religion of the teacher affect, for example, his ability to understand the meaning of the philosophy of Aristotle, or to expound the tactics and style of Thucydides? Even Ammianus can expose the false logic and partisan bitterness of the Emperor,[1] and sees that these men taught in the schools, not as Christians, but as scholars.

Literally it appears that this decree would only affect teachers in public schools, but could not prevent a private teacher from professing the study of the classics. Mr. Rendall seems to have no authority for saying so explicitly that the purpose of the rescript was "penally to prohibit Christians from teaching or publicly reading the masterpieces

[1] Amm. Marc., XXII.10.7. Illud autem erat inclemens obruendum perenni silentio quod arcebat docere *magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos* ritus Christiani cultores.

of pagan literature."[1] But though literally it does not appear that the rescript did this, in point of fact either it had that effect, or the Christians anticipated that this would be the next step in the Emperor's policy, for the Apollinares of Laodicea, having vacated their professorial chairs, started to produce a classical reconstruction of the Scriptures as a substitute for the pagan writers in Christian schools. Other celebrated Christian teachers resigned, Victorinus in Rome, Musonius and Proæresius of Athens, who had been Julian's own tutor. A few like Hecebolius apostatized. And the overwhelming evidence of the Christian writers agrees that the effect of the rescript was to close classical culture absolutely to Christians. St. Augustine summarizes the situation in the words, "He forbade liberal culture to Christians either as students or teachers."[2] Some of the Christian writers imply that there was a further decree, entirely prohibiting the attendance of Christians at the public schools, but there is no direct evidence of this, and there is the definite statement of the rescript, "None that desire to attend lectures

[1] Rendall, *The Emperor Julian*, p. 214.

[2] Aug., *de Civ. Dei.*, XVIII.52. Christianos liberales litteras docere et discere vetuit.

are debarred." What actually did happen was that the schools were regarded as mere hotbeds of pagan propaganda, and Christians avoided them. Miss Gardner comments that "we may perhaps conclude that Julian was here more far-sighted than his critics; that whole-hearted loyalty to the philosophers and poets of old was impossible to those who studied their works merely for the form, and disparaged all the underlying ideas."[1] But there is no reason to suppose that Christians even in the fourth century disparaged the underlying ideas, say, of Thucydides, or even of Plato. Julian objected to Christians not because their public lectures disparaged the underlying ideas of the philosophers and poets, but because they were Christians. The purpose of his rescript was admittedly to strike a blow at Christianity. In fact the object was to make the schools less centres of culture and more seminaries of paganism. Gibbon well sums up the position, "The Christians were directly forbid to teach: they were indirectly forbid to learn: since they would not frequent the schools of the pagans . . . Julian had reason to expect that in the space of a few years the Church would relapse into its primæval simplicity, and that

[1] Gardner, *Julian*, pp. 239–240.

the theologians, who possessed an adequate share of the learning and eloquence of the age, would be succeeded by a generation of blind and ignorant fanatics, incapable of defending the truth of their own principles, or of exposing the various follies of polytheism."[1] The Church was saved from this catastrophe. The life of the rescript at its longest could have been no more than a few months. It must have been issued, at the earliest, in the last months of 362; on March 5th, 363, Julian left Antioch and on June 26th he was killed. This, while accounting for the smallness of the effects secured, as well as for our comparative ignorance of the details of its administration, in no way lessens the illiberal and fanatical character of the enactment.

(*c*) In any case, already many of Julian's relations with individual towns and persons were conceived in an illiberal spirit. The individual acts were not always the work of Julian, but they were inspired by the religious temper, which his policy sought to promote. At Heliopolis a deacon named Cyril, a great enemy of idolatry, was massacred, and his liver eaten raw by the mob.[2] The holy virgins were exposed naked in

[1] p. 599, ed. Milm.

[2] Theodoret, III.7.

public; their bodies were shaved; they were ripped open, stuffed with hog-wash, and thrown to the pigs, an action which Sozomen attributes to a desire for revenge for the abolition of a species of religious prostitution.[1] Similar outbreaks occurred at Ascalon and Gaza.[2] At Gaza three Christians, Eusebius, Nestabis, and Zeno, were torn to pieces by roughs, and, according to Sozomen, when the magistrates repressed the mob, the Emperor reprimanded them severely, for noticing the public "retaliation on a few Galilæans, for all the wrongs they had done to the town and to the gods."[3] At Arethusa, the mob laid violent hands on the old bishop Mark, who had been instrumental in destroying a celebrated pagan temple, and, after subjecting him to every indignity, smeared his body with honey, and hung him in a net, a prey to the insects. At Paneas-Cæsarea (Cæsarea-Philippi) a statue of Jesus Christ was destroyed by order of the government.[4] At Berytus the count Magnus fired a church.[5] At Emesa, a city associated with Elagabalus, the mob transformed the principal church into a temple of Bacchus, and destroyed the

[1] Soz., v.10. [2] Theod., III.7; Soz., v.9.
[3] Soz., *l.c.*, cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.93.
[4] Soz., v.21. [5] Theod., IV.20.

Christian cemetery.[1] At Damas the Jews fired two churches. On the other hand, reprisals on the part of Christians were sternly dealt with. At Dorostolus a soldier, named Aemilius, was burnt at the stake for breaking up a pagan altar.[2] At Meros, in Phrygia, Macedonius, Theodulis, and Tatian were burnt, at the order of the Governor Amachius, for breaking the images in a re-opened pagan temple.[3] Basil, a presbyter of Ancyra, was flayed alive for public active opposition to the Pagan Revival, though, in his case, Sozomen states explicitly, the death penalty was carried out against the Emperor's wishes.[4]

These were some cases in which Julian himself was more actively involved. He caused Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, to be reduced from the position of a city, and to revert to its former name of Mazaca, for the obstinate devotion of its inhabitants to Christianity. Even after the church property of the city had been confiscated, the clergy enrolled in the local militia, and a poll tax imposed on all Christians, as onerous as that laid upon villages, Julian threatened further measures.[5] Nisibis, which sought support against the

[1] Theod., III.7. [2] Theod., III.7.
[3] Soz., V.11. [4] Soz., V.11. [5] Soz., V.4.

Persians, he refused to assist until the temples were again opened.[1] Constantius, formerly called Majuma, he made subject to Gaza, on the ground that the latter was a loyal pagan city and the former was not.[2] In Pessinus two young men overthrew the altar of the Magna Mater, and were put to the torture.[3] At Miletus churches and chapels containing relics were ordered to be destroyed.[4] At Cyzicus the bishop Eleusius had pulled down a Novatian church: he was ordered by the Emperor to rebuild it, and was expelled from the city.[5] At Bostra the bishop Titus had written to Julian, to inform him that the Christian clergy were largely instrumental in keeping order in the city. Julian, with a startling lack of decency, replied with an open letter to the town, in which he charged the bishop with libelling the citizens and plainly advised his expulsion.[6] At Edessa the Emperor confiscated the church demesne of the Arians, and handed their funds over to the resident military. In view of the bitter struggle between Arians and Valentinians, this may have been no more than a just retribution, but there was no need for

[1] Soz., v.3.
[2] Soz., v.3.
[3] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, v.40.
[4] Soz., v.20.
[5] Soz., v.15.
[6] Jul., *Ep.*, 52.

the Emperor to add the vulgar gibe, that, thus deprived of wealth, the Christians would find access to the Kingdom of God.[1]

Julian's stay at Antioch, a place which he describes, a little ingenuously, as a city of "lovers of Christ,"[2] gives the opportunity of seeing his relations with Christianity at close quarters. When he passed, in sacred procession, to purge the grove of Daphne, the Christian city came out with the relics of the martyr Babylas, and sang, "Confounded be all they that worship carved images,"[3] and when he passed through the streets, women sang, "The gods of the heathen, they are but silver and gold,"[4] or inside their houses shouted, "Let God arise and let His enemies be scattered."[5] As a crowning insult, either by accident, or design, the great temple of Apollo, at Daphne, was destroyed by fire. The gratuitous insolence of the Christians was met by the arrest of several of them, notwithstanding protests from the prefect Sallustius, who, though a pagan himself, had preserved a greater measure of tolerance.[6] A young man, named Theodore, was brutally tortured, and several others were imprisoned,

[1] Jul., *Ep.*, 43. [2] Jul., *Misop.*, 357C.
[3] Ps. XCVII. 7. [4] Ps. CXV. 4. [5] Ps. LXVIII. 1.
[6] For this man, see p. 26.

but none were put to death,[1] unless the presbyter Theodore, keeper of the sacred vessels, whose murder by the count Julian is mentioned elsewhere by Sozomen, is the same person.[2] The identification is not unlikely, for the count, who was the emperor's uncle as well as namesake, was present at the time; he was the agent of an additional crime, the closing of the principal church of the city, where, in fact, he exceeded his instructions, by committing shameful acts of sacrilege in its sanctuary.[3] In the face of the opposition he met, it seems as though the Emperor began at last to realize that Christianity was too strong for him. He made no attempt to rebuild the temple of Daphne; he merely contented himself with venting his rather puerile anger in writing the satire on Antioch, called *Misopogon*, in which he confesses that "the greater part of the population are adherents of Atheism," the Emperor's name for Christianity.[4] The satire, though amusing, is hardly in keeping with the dignity of an emperor.

There is still the case of Alexandria and Athanasius to be examined, before the more venomous part of Julian's policy is com-

[1] Soz., v. 2c.
[2] Soz., v. 8.
[3] Soz., v.8.
[4] Jul., *Misop.*, 357D.

pleted. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, had retired during the years of the Arian controversy, to make way for an Arian intruder into his see. He returned in 362, in virtue of Julian's decree of recall, but not until the usurping bishop was dead. Julian no sooner learnt of his return, than he wrote to Alexandria, stating that he had not intended recalled bishops to reoccupy their sees, and Athanasius must be dead to all decency to make such an assumption.[1] When Athanasius made no move, and actually resumed his ministry so far as to baptize some Greek ladies, Julian wrote a second letter ordering his banishment, not only from Alexandria, but from the whole of Egypt, and added an autograph postscript, calling for a persecution of the bishop.[2] No sooner had Athanasius withdrawn, in response to this second letter, than petitions were forwarded to the Emperor for his recall. The letter, in which Julian answered the petitions,[3] is a curious reflection on a professedly philosophic temper. The Hebrews, he urged, the progenitors of Christianity, had been once the slaves of the Egyptians; were the Egyptians to become the slaves of Christianity? In a confusion of historical names,

[1] *Ep.*, 26. [2] *Ep.*, 6. [3] *Ep.*, 51.

he proceeded to claim that the greatness of Egypt was due, successively, to Alexandria, to the Ptolemies, and to Augustus, a tale of progress to which the words of Jesus Christ had made no contribution. A panegyric on the sun followed, contrasting the visible power of the sun with the Alexandrians' belief that Jesus Christ was the son of God, though neither they nor their fathers had ever seen Him. After that not very logical argument, he concluded with a reference to Athanasius as "no man, but an absolute mannekin,"[1] language unknown outside the licence of the comic stage. Even one so friendly to Julian as Signor Negri admits that the Emperor's conduct lacked moderation, and assumed the aspect of a personal persecution.[2]

Alexandria had already been the scene of a bloody outbreak over the intrusion of the Arian bishop, George of Cappadocia, a man whom Ammianus pointedly describes as "forgetting his professed principles, which instil nothing but fairness and clemency."[3] Always unpopular among the orthodox, he was hated even by pagans as a violent iconoclast. On the death of Constantius, he

[1] μηδ' ἀνὴρ ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπισκος εὐτελής.

[2] Negri, *The Emperor Julian*, Eng. trans., II.381

[3] Amm. Marc., XXII.11.

had returned to Alexandria, but no sooner had he done so, than the pagan mob rose up and killed him.[1] Julian addressed a letter to the citizens deploring their violence, though admitting that George may well have deserved his fate, and forgiving the people what he called their zeal for the gods.[2] Judging from another letter,[3] the Emperor cared more about the safety of the bishop's books than he did for his life.

Instances of alleged persecution in the army must be received with caution. Two officers were publicly disgraced; of these, Valentinian was a tribune of the Imperial Guard; a drop of lustral water fell on his military cloak, and he tore the piece of stuff away in indignation. He was degraded, ostensibly for military misconduct.[4] He afterwards succeeded to the purple. The second, Jovian, was similarly treated. These events are said to have taken place in Gaul, and one may reasonably doubt any persecution of Christianity in them. It is further alleged, that count Julian caused the execution of two young soldiers, Bonosius and Maximilian, who refused to suppress the Labarum.[5]

[1] Amm. Marc., XXII.11; Soz., V.7; Hist. Aceph., 8.
[2] *Ep.*, 10. [3] *Ep.*, 9. [4] Soz., VI.6.
[5] See *Passio SS. Bonosii et Maximiliani*, in Ruinart, Acta primorum martyrum.

Two others, Juventinus and Maximus, were eventually executed on a charge of conspiracy; they had uttered some careless words about the sacrifices under the new regime.[1] On another occasion an uproar occurred after the giving of the donative to the prætorian troops; incense was thrown on the altar as a symbol of loyalty, whereupon one Christian was jeered at by the pagans, for the inconsistency of his action, and a riot followed; the ringleaders, all or many of them Christians were executed.[2] Theodoret adds a further case, that of the military prefect of Egypt, Artemius, executed for having destroyed idols in the reign of Constantine.[3] On the whole, these so-called persecutions of soldiers are to be received with caution; what might be an ordinary act on the part of a civilian was liable to be regarded as treason, when perpetrated by a soldier, and the punishment of mutiny and disloyalty might easily be described by later writers, like Theodoret, as acts directed at Christianity.

But, even if these military cases are set aside, and if it is granted that Julian was not directly responsible for many of the outrages

[1] Theod., III.15. Cf. John Chrysos., *In SS. Juv. et Max.*
[2] Theod., III.17. [3] Theod., III.18.

in isolated towns, there is still a heavy burden of evidence against the Emperor. It is very pertinent that the progress of Julian through Asia was the signal for outbursts against Christianity, and that when he reached Antioch he could break out into the most illiberal sentiments. Even in the cases where Julian can be acquitted of direct responsibility, his policy is still incriminated, for magistrate and commoner alike were inspired by what they understood the Emperor's policy to be. The favourite line of argument taken up by Julian's apologists is to discount the evidence of Christian writers, and to appeal to the silence of Ammianus, and usually of Julian himself. But Ammianus took little or no interest in any kind of religion, for he pays scant attention even to Julian's own pagan revival. Of the Emperor's letters, the greater number are lost, and nothing can be deduced from his silence. Who is more likely to be interested in Christianity than the Christian writers? And yet many modern historians steadily ignore their existence. The translator of Julian in the Loeb series says, quite seriously, that the principal authorities for his reign are, besides the Emperor himself, Ammianus and Libanius, as though Gregory and the historians were

not worth mentioning. Yet in point of fact Libanius is prejudiced, and not particularly illuminating. Gregory, it is true, is often vague and declamatory, but, at his worst, he is no more vague and declamatory than Julian himself, and is almost always a reliable eyewitness, who can rarely be convicted of inaccuracy. If Theodoret is to be read with caution, he is always a vivid and excellent commentator on the more prosaic, if at times more accurate, accounts of Socrates and Sozomen. The three taken together are a serious body of evidence, inaccurate only on points of detail. They appear to use good sources, where it is possible to check their statements, and it seems difficult to believe that their treatment of the reign of Julian is devoid of foundation in fact.

§ 4

RESULTS OF JULIAN'S POLICY

As far as Christianity was concerned, Julian's policy was a complete failure. "Christianity was hardly aware of the war he waged against it; its propaganda was not for a moment impeded; it pursued the even tenor of its

way, and was uninfluenced in its aim, and its ulterior manifestations."[1] A growing disappointment and annoyance in Julian's tone is the strongest evidence of this. His actions in Asia and his bitterness in the *Misopogon* are in marked contrast to the philosophic temper which he had once affected. A few persons apostatized, none of them of any great importance; the Emperor's uncle, the count Julian, was a coarse and bloodthirsty swashbuckler; the rhetorician Hecebolius was a fourth-century Vicar of Bray, and he reverted to Christianity at the death of Julian; the bishop Pegasius was apparently an infidel;[2] Felix and Elpidius were two court officials;[3] beyond these more prominent persons, there was a certain number of the rank and file.[4] In some cases the end was achieved by favouring pagans in making official appointments, to the exclusion of Christians.[5] The army was largely pagan, but this probably was not the result of Julian's policy; it was made up of foreign and non-Christian elements, and, judging from

[1] Negri, *op. cit.*, II.592. [2] Jul., *Ep.*, 72.

[3] Theod., III.12.

[4] Multi ex nostris, voluntate propria, corruerunt. Jerome, *Trans. Euseb. Chr.*, 286.

[5] Socr., III.13. See p. 40 on magistrates. Cf. Christianis statuit non debere committi utpote quibus etiam propria lex gladio uti vetuisset. Rufinus, *Hist. Eccles.*, I.32.

the case of Valentinian and others, even the army was not whole-heartedly with Julian as a religionist, however much it admired him as a soldier.

Even during Julian's lifetime, Maris, bishop of Chalcedon, was not afraid to denounce him publicly in the streets of Constantinople.[1] As soon as the Emperor was dead, Christianity was able to laugh at the discredited wreck of the pagan movement. "The priests are involved in vexatious lawsuits," says Libanius, . . . "of the temples some have been pulled down, those which are half finished stand for a laughing-stock to the Christian raff; the bodies of the philosophers are put to the torture, and the fact of having received a present from the sovereign is put down as a debt to the treasury; the professors of rhetoric are driven from the doors, like so many cut-throats."[2] The pagans became suddenly so powerless, that Gregory had to counsel moderation on the part of the Christian mob, in the very year of the Emperor's death.[3]

By ignoring the existence of women,[4] Julian had left a force against him the power of which he failed to recognize. His own

[1] Soz., v.4.
[2] Libanius, 620, 621.
[3] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, v.37.
[4] Jul., *Misop.*, 363A.

scheme of paganism was inadequate to supply the needs of the day. The persons he did attract were the irreligious, and those like Ammianus naturally indifferent to religion. Christianity was a bigger thing than Julian thought; and it may well be that it was a better thing.

It is significant that within ten years of Julian's death Hellenism became Paganism, the barbarous survival of the countryside. The accident of Julian's life, temporarily diverting the normal course of events, in the end only accelerated its natural progress. Hellenism, even as a system of education, was doomed. As Mr. Capes says, "he made men feel how intensely anti-Christian was the spirit of the schools, and how great was the possible danger of a like revival."[1] When Miss Gardner says that in the triumph of Christianity Julian foresaw the Dark Ages, she is giving to Julian the outlook of Mr. Lowes Dickinson, an idealization of Julian's standpoint, and an intellectual anticipation which is more attractive than accurate.[2]

Christianity itself was immensely helped by this sinister episode in its annals; the arrogance and irreligion of the court Chris-

[1] Capes, *University Life*, p. 126.
[2] Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

tianity of the house of Constantine was checked; the dissidence of the Christian sects was healed. The reign of Julian was the death-blow of Arianism, which had flourished principally under the protection of the reigning house. The council of Lampsacus, the first council after the death of Julian, condemned the Homœan creed of Ariminum and fifty-nine semi-Arian bishops subscribed the Homoousion.

PART II

JULIAN'S SCHEME OF A RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

§ I

THE APPROACH TO HELLENISM

BEING naturally a mystic, and having denied himself the higher features of Christianity through the invincible hatred he bore the professed faith of the house of Constantine, Julian had to look elsewhere to satisfy his cravings. His dissatisfaction with Christianity was probably increased by the prosaic presentation of the Faith, so characteristic of Arianism. His imagination was touched by the literature of ancient Greece set before him by his tutor Mardonius.[1] The lectures of the schools of Athens and Nicomedeia turned him to philosophy, which he appreciated without fully understanding. The later Alexandrian Platonism, however, which

[1] See p. 22.

substituted immediate intuition for reason, appealed strongly to his illogical but imaginative mind. Plato to him means Iamblichus and Porphyry. "Julian is not a philosopher," says M. Jules Simon, "he is a theurgist of the school of Iamblichus, a sophist of the school of Libanius; he is learned and well read, with a passion for the teaching of his masters, without seeking to explain it or sound its depths."[1]

His association with Maximus[2] was the deciding influence. Now Maximus was simply a magician, and henceforward the esoteric fancies of the initiated usurp in Julian's mind the function of rational and logical argument. "At the school of Maximus," says M. Allard, "Julian retained little of the logic of Aristotle; even of the sublime mysticism of Plato there survived in his mind only an image, deformed by the visions of the Neo-Platonists of the preceding generation, and adapted by them to what was most fitted to win their royal pupil—the explanation and justification of the pagan myths. The philosophy with which the influence of these latter teachers had filled the mind of Julian is entirely apologetic or entirely polemical;

[1] Simon, *Hist. de l'école d'Alexandrie*, II.320.
[2] p. 24.

it has practically nothing of the free search for Truth."[1] Julian himself accepts Maximus as the final influence in his conversion to Hellenism.[2] That Julian was no philosopher his two treatises—*On the Sovereign Sun* and *On the Mother of the Gods*—are a standing witness. A writer can be obscure because his thoughts are too profound to be conveyed in simple language; he may also be obscure because his thoughts are vague, and he does not know clearly what he is trying to say. The latter is the cause of Julian's obscurity.

Paganism to Julian meant, not philosophy, but theurgy, sacrifices, mysteries, and magic. He was under the delusion that he was like Marcus Aurelius,[3] and he certainly imitated the less characteristic actions of Marcus—his revival of the ancient Roman religion, and his borrowing of alien religious rites. Marcus, for instance, is said to have drowned lions in the Danube to propitiate the local deities; but Marcus was a philosopher first, and a mystic afterwards, Julian was only an imitation philosopher; his interests were entirely religious, while his ability was as

[1] Allard, *Julien l'Apostat*, III.322.
[2] Libanius, 376.
[3] Cf. Jul., *The Cæsars*, and *Ep. to Them. passim*. Amm. Marc., XXII.5.4; XVI.1.4; Eutropius, X. 16.

completely that of a soldier. As Prudentius says of him:

> . . . Ductor fortissimus armis,
> Conditor et legum celeberrimus ore manuque,
> Consultor patriæ sed non consultor habendae
> Religionis, amans tercentum milia divom.
> Perfidus ille Deo, quamvis non perfidus urbi.

The predecessor whom he most nearly resembled was not Marcus, but Aurelian, whose worship of Sol Invictus, though avowedly Oriental, was the same system that Julian designated Hellenism.

In 351, at Nicomedeia, Julian pronounced for the Paganism which afterwards he sought to elaborate into a system to rival Christianity. In Gaul in 356 he practised the pagan rites secretly.[1] Before leaving Asia, he had probably been initiated into Mithraism, and, while in Athens in 355, into the Eleusinian Mysteries. When called to be Cæsar he felt, he says, that he was called by the gods, who appeared to him in a vision and promised their help.[2] From that time onwards he regarded himself as the instrument of the Divinity, whom he understood to be Mercury,[3] much as Napoleon professed

[1] Julian, *Ep. to Athens.* [2] Jul., *Or.*, VII. 233B.

[3] Occulte Mercurium supplicabat, quem mundi velociorem sensum esse motum mentium suscitantem theologicae prodidere doctrinae. Amm. Marc., XVI.4.

to regard himself as the tool of Destiny. His stay in Gaul gave him the opportunity to elaborate his paganism, and to feel its reality. Though it is recorded by Ammianus that in 361, in Vienne, he entered a Christian church for the last time, this act was probably performed with a pagan intention.[1] In Illyria, in the same year, he made his first public profession of paganism by sacrificing before the army.[2] Reaching Constantinople he took the first definite step in the public pagan revival by a decree for the reopening of the temples, and the campaign against Christianity began. What was meant by the Emperor to be the strongest weapon in his hands was the new pagan system he began to elaborate.

§ 2

JULIAN'S RELIGIOUS SCHEME

(a) Institutional

BARON VON HÜGEL has given three divisions of Christianity: (a) the Institutional or Church; (b) the Historical or Intellectual;

[1] See p. 29. He attended the Christian funeral of Constantius in 361, but this was purely an official and formal act.

[2] Jul., *Ep.*, 38.

(c) the Mystical and Metaphysical. It will be valuable to examine Julian's counter scheme under three similar divisions.

(a) Having decreed the restoration of the pagan temples, he made the scheme of the old religion his starting-point by giving a new force to the official title of Pontifex Maximus. Instead of regarding this title as a mere official dignity and using it, as his predecessors had done, for any end to which the opportunity of the moment might point, he treated it as a definite consecration to religious service, which turned the Empire into a kind of theocracy. As Pontifex Maximus and therefore official head of the Pagan Church, he assumed the right of appointing the principal provincial priests, as well as the power of punishing defaulters, of defining a creed, and of settling, by his own decision, all religious disputes.[1] His letters on these subjects read like the Pastoral Charges of a Christian Bishop. Like Maximin Daza,[2] he conceived the idea of forming a pagan church. Unlike Maximin, he was well acquainted with the methods of Christianity, and, without any attempt at concealment, he made the Christian Church his model. That was the

[1] Cf. Jul., *Epp.*, 21, 49, 62, 63.
[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VIII.14; IX.4.

key to the excellence of many features of Julian's scheme; he saw the strong points of Christianity, and he was not ashamed to borrow them. The paganism of the Empire was without organization; it had neither theology, nor institutions, much less a foundation of historical facts. Julian was quick to recognize that defect, and did his best to supply a remedy. But there was a vital difference between Julian's scheme, and the Christian Church. The latter was a natural growth from a historical fact, while the former was an artificial imposition, on a foundation which scarcely existed. Julian's scheme was foredoomed to failure, not because it was defective in itself, but because it was built in the air.

The church of Hellenism was itself excellent in idea, a signal instance of Julian's gift of organization. It was to be an independent spiritual force, divorced entirely from the State, except in so far as the head of the State was also the High Priest. Unlike the old paganism, the Hellenic church was not to be the mere tool of the government, an ornamental and uninspiring adjunct to the Imperial Idea. In all his ecclesiastical letters and edicts, therefore, Julian is careful to describe himself not as Emperor, but as

"Pontifex Maximus of the religion of my country."[1] Priests are expressly required not to flatter the civil magistrates.[2] Consonant with that ideal, a hierarchy is the outstanding feature of the church scheme. Under the Pontifex there is to be the provincial High Priest, an official who had always existed since the establishment of the cult of Rome and Augustus in the early days of the Empire. Hitherto he had been merely a wealthy citizen succeeding hereditarily, charged with the expenses of the public sacrifices and the yearly games. But now he is to be the head of the priests of the province. Before, he had assumed his priestly functions only for the temporary performance of the necessary duty, to retire afterwards into the seclusion of the ordinary layman. The essence of Julian's hierarchy is the principle, Once a priest always a priest. The duties of the provincial priest are now nearly those of the Christian bishop,[3] and it seems as if he is entrusted with further administrative powers over the laity to coerce them into religious conformity.[4] Maximin had given to the priests powers of police and the right

[1] Jul., *Ep.*, 62. [2] *ib. Ep.*, 63.

[3] The very word is used to describe his functions—ἐπισκοπουμένῳ τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν. Jul., *Ep.*, 63.

[4] Jul., *Ep.*, 63.

to bring an armed force against obstinate Christians; but it is now explicitly stated that the priest himself is not to use violence.[1] Usually Julian left the hereditary priest in office, but sometimes he appointed a leading philosopher to the position.[2]

Under this provincial priest was the priest of each village—what in the Christian Church would be the parish priest. In the case of towns where there were several temples, one of the local priests was probably endowed with juridical powers over the rest, very much as at that time the town bishop may have been a subordinate official over the township, but subject to the superior jurisdiction of the provincial bishop. The hierarchy of Julian was thus borrowed largely from the Christian Church, from the idea of the indelibility of Holy Orders down to details of jurisdiction. The only noteworthy departure from Christian usage was the maintenance of women as priestesses in certain shrines.

In no branch was the priesthood any longer to continue as a hereditary right: it was to be a vocation, tested by fitness and piety, without regard to wealth or station.[3] Julian has

[1] Jul., *Ep.*, 62. Cf. St. Paul, A bishop must be no striker. 1 Tim. III.3.

[2] e.g. Chrysanthius.

[3] Jul., *fragg.* ed. Hertlein, 390–1.

himself laid down regulations for the priest's life, so strict as to cover even his family, who were now expected to be regular worshippers in the temples,[1] an example of godliness which hitherto had been sadly lacking.[2] The priest himself was to be careful in the selection of his books, in order to avoid erotic novels and infidel writers, like Pyrrho and Epicurus:[3] on the model of the Christian clergy he was to recite his offices at fixed hours,[4] three times a day, or at least morning and evening,[5] and to make this possible, he was provided with a psalter of pagan hymns.[6] He was required to be a man of charity and kindness, the attributes of God,[7] a demand which, in phraseology at least, was almost certainly derived from St. Paul.[8] Perfect gravity and chastity in his private life were to be fostered by careful attention to haunts and habits.[9] To ensure that end, he was to avoid theatres and taverns,[10] and the society found there, especially jockeys, actors, and dancers;[11] he must follow no trade;[12] and

[1] I Tim. III.4.
[2] Soz., V.16.
[3] Jul., *Ep.*, 49.
[4] Soz., V.16.
[5] Jul., *fragg.*, 387.
[6] *ibid.*
[7] Jul., *fragg.*, 289AB, 300B; *Epp.*, 49 and 63.
[8] Titus III.4.
[9] Jul., *Ep. to Arsacius.*
[10] *ibid.*
[11] Jul. Frag. of a letter to a priest, 304C.
[12] *Ep. to Arsacius.*

he was particularly warned against wearing his official dress outside the temple,[1] and being seen in the market; he was even to forgo every kind of intercourse with municipal officials except in the temple itself.[2] The reason of this seems to be, that in the temple the priest took precedence of everyone, but outside, municipal dignitaries took precedence of the priests, and so there was danger of a slight to religion in the eyes of the populace. Julian stood strictly for the "benefit of clergy"; offenders in their ranks were brought for discipline to the provincial priest, and not before the civil magistrate. Epistle 62 is addressed to some person, apparently a priest, who had struck another priest. The offender is prohibited by Julian, as the Supreme Priest and mouthpiece of the Didymæan oracle (not as chief magistrate), from undertaking any temple service for three months. He is then put under the supervision of the chief priest of the district (or provincial High Priest).

Julian's idea of the priesthood has been described as Oriental. It would be more accurate to call it Christian; of the Persian, Egyptian, and other Oriental religions which emphasized the reality of the priesthood,

[1] *Ep. to Arsacius.* [2] *Ep.*, 49.

Julian does not show any signs of special knowledge; Christianity he did know intimately, and continually recurring reminiscences of St. Paul's epistles suggest something more than an accident in phraseology. And it was still Christianity he imitated when he came to deal with the question of Poor Relief. The bishops had become the official guardians of the poor,[1] and the care of the poor without distinction between Christian and pagan was the most pleasing feature of the Church of this period. The Emperor could not yet demand a similar duty from the priests of Hellenism, for they had not the necessary funds at their disposal. Anxious not to lose the ideal of universal brotherhood,[2] Julian appealed for an establishment of pagan almonries, the funds for which would be provided by the State. As a first step, out of a large supply of wheat and wine which he provided for the province of Galatia, he ordered that a fifth should be used for the benefit of the priests, acolytes, and attendants, and the remainder might be distributed in relieving the poor.[3] He added that some attempt ought to be made, on the part of pagan churchmen, to make provision out of

[1] See p. 16.

[2] Cf. Julian, 291D, 292B.

[3] *Ep.*, 49.

their own wealth for such charity, emphasizing his plea with a text from his pagan Bible, the poet Homer.[1] Sozomen adds that "the point of ecclesiastical discipline which he chiefly admired and desired to establish among pagans, was the custom the bishops followed of giving letters of recommendation to those who travelled to foreign lands, wherein they commended them to the hospitality and kindness of other bishops."[2] This Julian eventually sought to provide also for paganism,[3] and, at the same time, he tried to inculcate a care for the decent burial of the poor.[4]

He carried his imitation further, in attempting to found religious communities for pagans, on the lines of Christian monasteries.[5] Sozomen says quite clearly, that these were for men as well as women, but, as Gregory makes no mention of men,[6] it is possible that these were meant as colleges for the education of priestesses. He emphasized the duty of fasting as a means of spiritual power, as well as for various rather foolish mystical reasons.[7] He even carried his imitation of Christianity

[1] *Odyssey*, XIII.56–58.
[2] Soz., V.16.
[3] Cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.111.
[4] *Ep.*, 49.
[5] Soz., V.16.
[6] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.111.
[7] Jul., *Or.*, V., *Mother of the Gods*, *passim*.

so far as to introduce a sermon into pagan worship, a feature previously unknown.[1] This apparently was a failure; it wearied the pagan congregation, and produced no converts.[2] The Emperor himself saw that the details of worship were carried out so punctiliously, that he got the name of "the Slaughterer,"[3] and his ceremonial draws a restrained though sardonic rebuke from Ammianus.[4] He forbade applause at his entrance into a temple.[5]

There is no doubt that this was the effective side of Julian's scheme. He saw that the weakness of the old national religion lay in its lack of organization, and its failure to co-ordinate one section of the faith with another. He saw that the strength of Christianity lay just in the points where Paganism was weak. He was eminently successful in his attempt to organize paganism, mainly because organization is independent of the truth or falsehood of the religion of which it is the setting . He was less successful when he came to co-ordinate the disconnected elements of pagan belief.

[1] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.111.
[2] Libanius, *Ad Antiochenos*, 1.503.
[3] Amm. Marc., XXII. 22.14.3.
[4] Ostentationis gratia vehens licenter pro sacerdotibus sacra, stipatusque mulierculis laetabatur. Amm. Marc., *l.c.*
[5] Jul., *Ep.*, 64.

§ 3

JULIAN'S RELIGIOUS SCHEME—*continued*

(b) Historical

SUCH a co-ordination of the elements of belief is the historical side of religion. Here Christianity was invincible. It stood by its relation to a definite historical person—the Lord Jesus Christ. Its faith was summarized in a simple historical statement—the Creed. Its origin and development were explicitly set out in the history of the dealings of the Almighty with mankind, contained in the Sacred Scriptures.

It was in the attempt to provide Hellenism with a parallel element that Julian failed most signally. He had before him the confused medley of the ancient myths, the alien growths of mystical Oriental religions, the vague and irrational theology of the Greek mysteries, and the intuitions of the Neo-Platonic philosophy. He was further incapacitated for the task he set himself by a congenital inability to understand the theory

of history, and a lack of critical sense. He was capable of attempting to reconstruct the Jewish nation, when the barest reference to their history would have convinced him that such action was flying in the face of all Roman Imperial policy. He can cite complacently Perseus, Minos, Aeacus, Dardanus, Plato, Socrates, Aristides, Alexander, and Cæsar as parallel and similar historical authorities.[1] There is a ludicrous touch in the attempt to combine the immoralities of the Eastern cults with the Stoicism of a Marcus. Gregory and Ammianus are equally awake to the folly of it; Gregory smiles at the loving-cups pledged to courtesans,[2] and Ammianus turns in disgust from the vicious women[3] of the Emperor's Oriental ritual. The whole attempt to create a historical basis for Hellenism, with Homer and the Homeric hymns for its bible, produces only a weird confusion—a mythological chaos at times ingenious but rarely plausible.

The Emperor was himself a mystic, and as such his religion, so far as it was his own personal faith, had most of the truer and finer features of all religions. His religious

[1] Cf. Julian, *Against Christians, passim.*

[2] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, v.22.

[3] Stipatus mulierculis. See p. 78, note 4.

scheme, however, was not meant for himself, but for other people. It is not that Julian was an irreligious man—for he was fanatically devoted to religion[1]—but that the scheme which he imagined could express for other people the religious emotions he felt himself, not only failed to do so, but even failed to express any religion at all. As Julian's arguments against Christianity were not the arguments which had convinced himself, so his elaborate religious scheme was not the theoretical foundation on which his own religious experience was built.

He had been initiated into the Dionysiac mysteries, for he speaks of "the silence of the adept," which he is bound to observe;[2] he had revived the oracles and had himself become a sybil;[3] he had restored the Oriental practice of divination, which Constantine had forbidden; he had been admitted into the mysteries of Mithras; and his favourite guide was Maximus the medium. All this goes to show that his religion was evidently of an immediate mystical type; Ammianus con-

[1] It is notable that one of his most characteristic prohibitions is the reading of Epicurus and Pyrrho, as calculated to produce atheism. See p. 74.

[2] Jul., *Or.*, VII.218A—*βοῦς ἐπὶ γλωσσῆς.*

[3] *ib. Ep.*, 62—*ἔλαχον δὲ νοῦ καὶ τοῦ Διδυμαίου προφητεύειν.*

demns it as mere superstition.[1] Religion of this kind cannot have any historical basis. Even in Christianity the complete mystic is outside and above the normal scheme. He is, like "the tongues" in the primitive Church, something that stands alongside of the normal production of the regular system. A charismatic ministry can exist by the side of the usual ministry; it cannot be derived from it, nor can it be introduced directly into the ordered scheme, any more than it can be produced by the ordered scheme. Julian was gifted, not perhaps with inspiration, but with that species of spiritual insight, which mysticism gives. It is because he sought to produce the same effect in others by a wholly illogical system, that the historical side of his religion is so weak. A creed and a system which is natural, because historical, like Christianity, will create religious men. Julian acted as if he thought that any creed or system, artificially evolved, so long as it was not Christianity, would create men like himself, religious, but anti-Christian.

For the general public he did not apparently make the mysteries, or even Mithraism, the normal scheme. He sought to co-

[1] Amm. Marc., xxv.4; Praesagiorum sciscitationi nimiae deditus.

ordinate every national and local cult, so as to make a pagan mythology which would be the historical foundation of religion. He took for his starting-point national gods, showing in his letters to Egypt marked respect for the Egyptian gods,[1] and acknowledging Jehovah as the national god of the Jews.[2] From that starting-point he argued up to the supreme god, the Sun.[3] But the vagueness and obscurity of Julian's historical theology is apparent in the attempt to correlate the Hellenic and other deities to the Sun. There are apparently four supreme gods—Jupiter, the Sun, Mars, and Minerva.[4] But the vital point is that Julian does not appear to differentiate very clearly between them; Mars represents the divine from the point of view of Rome, Minerva from the point of view of Athens; Jupiter is the divine in popular faith, and the Sun is the divine to the philosopher. It almost looks as if these four names represent only different aspects of the same divine principle. The national gods are minor agents, deriving their powers from the supreme source;[5]

[1] Jul., *Epp.*, 6.10.51.

[2] *Book against the Christians*, p. 230.

[3] Cf. *Ep.*, 13, and *Or.*, IV., *On King Helios*. For the nature of the gods see p. 90.

[4] *Ep. to the Athenians, passim.*

[5] *Book against the Christians, passim.*

Horus and Mithras are other names for the Sun;[1] Apollo is apparently identified with the Sun, at least popularly;[2] and Julian himself identifies the Sun with Jove, Pluto, and Serapis, quoting in support an old oracle

εἷς Ζεὺς, εἷς Ἀΐδης, εἷς Ἥλιος ἐστὶ Σαράπις.[3]

The other gods are helpers of the Sun; Aphrodite is the combining principle,[4] Dionysus the disseminative power of the Sun,[5] and Asclepios is begotten of the Sun in the world, to preserve life.[6]

The impression that all this gives is that for Julian these gods did not exist; they are only modes of the Sun's being, or descriptions of the way the Sun does his work. This view is emphasized further by Julian's method of dealing with the myths. Some mythology he rejects altogether as "incredible and monstrous;" examples are the stories of Saturn eating his children, the incest of Jupiter, Bacchus torn into pieces and restored.[7] Other myths he allegorizes; the birth of the Sun from Thea and Hypereion he explains as meaning that the Sun is

[1] Jul., *Cæsars*, 336C
[2] *Or.*, IV. 144A.
[3] *Or.*, IV. 136B.
[4] *Or.*, IV. 150C.
[5] *Or.*, IV. 144A–C.
[6] *Or.*, IV. 144B.
[7] Jul., *Book against Christians*, p. 167. Cf. *the Cæsars, passim.*

produced from the supernal and all-surpassing Godhead.[1] The myth of Attis he expounds at great length and with much obscurity;[2] the Mother of the gods is the worker for the Sun, identified by Julian with Minerva or Pronoe;[3] Attis is the lowest stage of the Sun's demiurgic power, the point at which the divine comes into contact with the material;[4] the Gallus is the Galaxias, the Milky Way, the border-line, where the creative power of the god ends and that of Attis begins; the love of the Great Mother is the higher power of the gods seeking to wean the demiurgic force from its attraction to matter. But Attis goes down into the cave with the nymph, so effecting the junction with matter, and his emasculation means the restriction of his productive power, the limitation of the material generation in the world to certain definite forms.

Nothing could show more plainly the ineffectiveness of Julian's historical basis for religion. The gods of Olympus have gone, and their places are taken by abstractions. Such a system could have made no impression on the popular mind. It could have attracted no converts, for it was incapable of a simple

[1] ὑπερίων = surpassing, and θεία = godhead. *Or.*, IV. 136C.
[2] *Or.*, V. [3] *Or.*, V. 179A. [4] See p. 92.

presentation, and nothing incapable of a simple presentation can be impressed on the minds and affections of the populace. It is doubtful whether even Julian himself cared much for this kind of thing. In the earlier days of his paganism his god was Mercury,[1] but, as a matter of fact, he had no place in his personal religion for anything but immediate perception; his own idea of God does not seem to involve anything like personal existence. Being nothing of a thinker, he appears to have imagined that the rapid and careless essays he wrote at a sitting would be sufficient to divert the follies of popular mythology into a true scientific channel.

When he comes to certain practical details of his system he is on firmer ground. He is on the right lines for securing popular success when he attends to the observance of pagan feast-days, and he is particularly clever when he fixes them on recognized Christian festivals; the feast of Sol Invictus is December 25th, synchronizing with Christmas; the cult of Attis and the Great Mother probably made a sinister appeal to him because its festival was March 25th, the day of the Christian feast of the Annunciation, all the more significant because some of the

[1] Amm. Marc., XVI.4.

Fathers saw a parallel between the Holy Child and His Mother, and Attis and the Magna Mater.[1]

Although he is described as a Neo-Platonist, Julian is really a theurgic mystic with a *penchant* for ceremonial. The feature of his revival that strikes an unobservant pagan like Ammianus is not the spread of philosophy, but the spread of ceremonial.[2] The historical side of the revival was weak because it interested the Emperor, not as religion, but as literature. In spite of his demand that the professors of pagan literature should be believers, it was the literary and not the religious beauty of the ancient authors that he loved himself. Homer was his literary bible, but the oracle and the diviner were the guides of his spiritual life.

§ 4

JULIAN'S RELIGIOUS SCHEME—*continued*

(c) Philosophical

FOR the same reason the metaphysical basis of Julian's religion was, if not unsound, at

[1] Isidore, *Ep.*, IV.31.28. Cf. Hastings', *Enc. of Religion and Ethics*, "Attis."

[2] Augebantur autem caeremoniarum ritus immodice. Amm. Marc., XXII 12.17.

least inconsistent with his own ideal. The metaphysical basis of any religion is the fruit of reflective deduction after generations of development. Religion has certain facts; its metaphysics are the statement of the philosophic forms lying behind these facts. But Julian's metaphysics were part of his facts, and like them they were artificial. For Julian did not take the facts or phenomena of Mithraism, or of any recognized religion, and seek to draw out their metaphysical implications, nor did he adopt the Neo-Platonic version of Reality, and try to fit to it the scheme and features of Paganism; he selected elements from this religion and that; and side by side with them he laid fragments from the teaching of Plotinus and Iamblichus, with the result that his religion was a confused mass of arbitrarily selected myths and chaotic philosophical explanations, while the rational effect of the whole was neutralized by Julian's devotion to Revelation, as the supreme method of religious knowledge. Neo-Platonism was eclectic; it combined the mysticism of the Pythagoræans, the idealism of the later Platonists, the emanation-pantheism of the Stoics, and the scientific method of Aristotle. Its root principle was that all things are in

God, rather than the Stoic conception that God is in all things. Plato had found Reality in Thought and Knowledge, the theory of Ideas; the Neo-Platonists assumed the Ideas to be the intermediary between the One or First Principle, and the world of sense-perceptions, which meant simply that the First Principle or Reality was unknowable. According to Plotinus, the First Principle is the One, not an Idea like the Good of Plato, but the principle of all Ideas. Of it nothing can be predicated, not even being or not-being. The first departure from the One is Nous or Intelligence; it is the One determined as Thought and Being, and includes all the Ideas. Further removed still is the Soul; Soul is the second link between the One and the Many. From it, by emanations, contact with Matter is established; emanation from the Triad, the One, Nous, Soul, is involuntary, and the effect of Necessity. Matter is indeterminate, negative, and wholly evil. The phenomenal world is produced by emanations from the Soul into Matter. Man might win his way back to Soul by Ecstasy,[1] independently of all reason or consciousness.

[1] This is the true principle of Julian's religion. Much of the later Christian mysticism has similar teaching. Cf. Hugh of St. Victor. See Gardner, *Dante and the Mystics*.

In Julian's own scheme the First Principle is the One,[1] the Good, the Idea of Being.[2] The subordinate orders of Being are three in number, the Intelligible,[3] the Intellectual,[4] and the Cosmic. The Intelligible gods are round the One, not exactly emitted from him;[5] each god is without substance or body;[6] he has scarcely a personality, though "all that he wills, that he is, and can do, and puts into action."[7] These gods correspond to Plato's Ideas, and the highest of them is Helios, king Sun.[8]

King Helios, as the Demiurge, reaches out of this world into the next below it, the Intellectual,[9] and takes his place in that world in another phase, supplying the Intellectual gods with the condition of their being, *τὸ νοεῖν* and *τὸ νοεῖσθαι*. This is the world of Thought, and the Sun in this world is the equivalent of the Logos, the Light, the Interpreter of Reality. It is the Sun who bestows on the Intellectual the attributes of the Good, beauty, existence,

[1] *τὰ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Νοῦ*, Jul., *Or.*, IV. 132D.

[2] *ibid.* [3] *τὸ νοητόν.* [4] *τὸ νοερόν.*

[5] *περὶ ὃν πάντα, καὶ οὗ ἕνεκα πάντα ἐστίν.* Jul., *Or.*, IV.1 36D. The language has a strong Johannine tinge. *βασιλέα περὶ ὃν πάντα ἐστίν*, Jul., *Or.*, IV. 132C.

[6] *ἀσώματοι; ἄυλοι*, Jul., *Or.*, IV. 145A.

[7] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 142D.

[8] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 133B. [9] *τὸ νοερόν.*

perfection, and oneness.[1] To this world belong the gods of mythology, as helpers of Helios.

In the Cosmic order, the Sun is similarly supreme. He is the Demiurge, issuing from the Intellectual, and bringing some of the Intellectual energy into the Cosmic. "This visible disc, third in rank, is clearly for the objects of sense—perception the cause of preservation.[2] He is the chief of the demiurgic deities of the Cosmic order.[3] He is the creator of the world therefore, though not in time, for creation is an eternal process.[4] This world also has its gods, the visible or apparent gods, of which the sun, moon, and stars (planets) are examples, the sun being the chief.[5] Beneath these Cosmic gods are Angels, Dæmons, Heroes, and Souls,[6] deriving their energy from the Sun, and having superintendence of various human functions. The matter of the visible world is eternal,[7] but needs to be animated by divine essence

[1] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 133C.

[2] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 133C. Preservation (σωτηρία) expressed the idea of initiation into the mysteries. Julian probably used it with this technical meaning. Also perhaps with some reference to the Christian idea of Redemption. The visible disc is the Logos.

[3] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 140.A

[4] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 146C.

[5] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 146D.

[6] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 145C.

[7] Jul,. *Or.*, V. 170CD.

to become passible, comprehensible to human sense.[1] The method and manner of the animation of matter by Soul transcends reason. The story of Attis is an allegory of such contact of Soul with matter.[2] Creation is thus effected by emanations from the higher world.

There is much in common between Julian's metaphysics and the metaphysics of Christianity as outlined by their first exponent, the Johannine author. Much that Julian says of king Helios might be said with equal fidelity of the Divine Logos; indeed there are curious parallels even of phrasing; Julian's description of the visible phase of Helios, "This visible disc . . . is clearly for the objects of sense-perception the cause of preservation,"[3] is only a stilted variation of the Johannine description of the Logos, "This was the true Light, that lighteth everyone that cometh into the world."[4] Possibly the source of Julian's philosophy was the same as the source of St. John's, though

[1] Jul., *Or.*, v. 161D, where apparently Attis is identified with the creative energy of Helios, an example of Julian's confusing habit of identifying one god or legend with another.

[2] See Jul., *Or.*, v.

[3] Jul., *Or.*, iv. 133C.

[4] St. John i. 9. Cf. Ep. to Hebrews i. 1–3, a work of similar metaphysical implications.

direct Alexandrian influence on St. John is questioned. Again Helios in his three manifestations in the worlds, Intelligible, Intellectual, and Cosmic, is singularly like the Christian Trinity with the Father in Heaven, the Son, the Logos or Mediator to the Soul of man, and the Holy Spirit, the active guide in the world of sense. Here also there is a suspicion of Christian influence on Julian's scheme, more unconscious perhaps than in the case of his church organization, but not the less vital.

The other metaphysical details of Julian's theology are simpler, and more easy to explain. His mystical theology already described was closely akin to what is now called Theosophy, an esoteric and spiritual relation with higher things. Julian summarized it himself, by saying that the sum of happiness consists in the apprehension of the Divine.[1] Vague and obscure as may be his exposition of what he means by godhead, he says quite clearly that "by our souls we are all intuitively persuaded of the existence of Deity."[2] The corollary to these beliefs is the immortality of the soul. Believing, as Julian did,

[1] *τὸ κεφάλαιον εὐδαιμονιάς τῶν θεῶν γνῶσις* where *γνῶσις* does not mean intellectual knowledge, but mystical apprehension.

[2] Jul., *Or.*, VII. 209C.

in the eternity of matter and the permanence of spirit, he was sure to hold to some doctrine of the soul's immortality. The Neo-Platonic doctrine, like that of the modern Theosophist, was reincarnation. That is not quite so explicitly put forward by Julian. The advanced Neo-Platonists like the Pythagoræans had a horror of animal sacrifices, because they believed an animal was the reincarnation of a soul. This must have been far from the thought of Julian, the Slaughterer. Death to him is rest,[1] but he foresees that this rest may be ended, apparently by another incarnation, for, at the end of his Hymn to the Sun, he prays that he may abide with the Divine, for ever if possible, but if that is more than the actions of his life deserve, then for many periods of years.[2] So that the duration of heavenly intercourse seems to depend on the extent to which the soul has surrendered itself to the Divine during its period of junction with matter, because such surrender to the Divine purifies the soul.[3] The practice of the Presence of God was to Julian, as to the Christian, the way to perfection. This is one more instance of Julian's mysticism.

[1] ἡσυχία ὁ θάνατος ἐστίν. *Ep.*, 77.
[2] Jul., *Or.*, IV 158C. [3] Cf. Jul., *Or.*, V. 178B.

Though after death there will be reward and punishment, yet even Tartarus, the place of the Soul's punishment, is not outside the mercy of God.[1] The details of this point are far from clear; Immortality to Julian more exactly means reabsorption into the Divine All-soul.[2] His faith is firm and strong; faith however not in personal immortality, or resurrection, but in a return of the spirit to the God who gave it.

It is said by M. Allard that Julian's theology has no idea of sin and expiation.[3] This is not strictly the case. It is true that on his deathbed he makes his confession in the words: "I die without remorse as I have lived without guilt. I am pleased to reflect on the innocence of my private life, and I can affirm with confidence that the supreme authority, that emanation of the Divine Power (i.e. his soul), has been preserved in my hands pure and immaculate."[4] On this Newman writes up an epitaph of scathing censure: "In the insensibility of conscience, in the ignorance of the very idea of sin, in the contemplation of his own moral consistency, in the simple absence of fear, in the cloudless

[1] Jul., *Frag. Ep.*, 300B.
[2] Jul., *Or.*, IV. 152A.
[3] Op. cit., III.122
[4] Amm. Marc., XXV.3.15–23.

self-confidence, in the serene self-possession, in the cold self-satisfaction we recognize the mere philosopher."[1] This is not altogether just. Julian had been initiated into the mysteries and into the cult of Mithras, in both of which the idea of illumination corresponds very closely with the Christian sacramental doctrine of sin forgiven. In practice this does not appear to have had much effect in producing any high moral ideal. Miss Gardner says, probably quite rightly, that in the cult of Mithras and Helios there was no moral substructure. What moral meaning it was subsequently made to convey was an artificial addition, due to conscious adaptation by individual thinkers.[2] On the other hand, Harnack says that the ethical temper which Neo-Platonism sought to beget was the highest and purest which the culture of the ancient world produced.[3] In the case of Julian, who sought to combine the cults of the mysteries with Neo-Platonism, these two statements appear contradictory; in point of fact there are details which modify them. The mysteries, both of Mithras and of Greece, though revolving round the idea

[1] *Idea of a University*, p. 196.
[2] *Julian*, p. 187.
[3] *History of Dogma*, Eng. trans., I. 336.

of purification, did not actually effect any such result; there was much gross indecency; witness the obscene symbols frequently used, and the immorality of many legends common in rites such as those of the Great Mother. The mysteries produced a high moral life probably only in a few persons of special spiritual insight and high character. Similarly Neo-Platonism, being essentially esoteric, could have this refining effect on some, while its teaching was ineffective and worthless to the general, as all esoteric teaching is apt to be. This proved true in the experience of Julian, who did not hesitate to acquiesce in the immoral masquerades of Alexandria and Antioch which flourished under the guise of religion, an acquiescence that aroused even the contempt of Ammianus.[1]

All through Julian himself was better than his system. From his conception of the Sun being in the visible world the agent of all that is good, he sought to draw a lesson of personal virtue, and his conception of man, as a soul guiding a body, led in the same direction.[2] He took the maxims of Diogenes for his model, the γνωθὶ σεαυτόν for his basis, and, perhaps unconsciously,

[1] Amm. Marc., XXII.14.

[2] ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ψυχὴ χρωμένη σώματι. Jul., *Or.*, VI. 183B.

the teaching of Christianity for his practice. His own personal morality has never been questioned,[1] whether it was the result of his religion or of his natural disposition; he was abstemious in diet, and hardy in regime.[2] The fact nevertheless remains, that he could not make his system popular. He happened himself to have something of the tastes of an old Stoic, and at the same time a fancy for theurgy and mysticism, but there was nothing in nature to unite theurgic manifestations, classical mythology, and austere morals. One man might combine a passion for all three, but it could only be the result of accident.

§ 5

THE FAILURE OF JULIAN'S SCHEME

By the irony of fate, Julian turned his face to the East. In the West his plan of religion might have had a measure of support; Christianity was as yet only making tentative progress in several of the Western provinces; the Stoic elements in Julian's

[1] Amm. Marc., XVI.5; XXIV.4.27, etc.
[2] *Misopogon*, 340BC.

ethics might have commended themselves to Rome, and the pure paganism in which he acquiesced rather than delighted, would have been welcome in the country. The people would never have probed the depths of the religion, but the average man rarely does get to the bottom of any religion. Many would have accepted it cheerfully and practised it faithfully. But Julian was a Greek, and he turned his back on the Roman world, to offer his mysticism to men too long rooted in Christianity to care for innovation, the best of them too clever to accept a religion so chaotic, the worst of them too superficial to understand the esoteric significance of what was externally so unsatisfying.

Julian failed with this weapon which he had hoped would be his most effective means of destroying Christianity. "I went to Berœa," he says, "and had a few words with the Council on religion; they were unanimous in praise of what I said, but very few were convinced, and they only such as were faithful Hellenes before I addressed them."[1] The solitary priest with a goose for a sacrifice at Antioch was typical of the indifference with which Julian's religion was received. Ammianus, himself a pagan, sums

[1] Jul., *Ep. to Libanius*, No. 27.

up the situation with his wonted colourless disapproval, "Ceremonial observances increased out of all reason."[1]

Most of the professed pagans were callous. The philosophers found the occasion one to improve; they swarmed to the Court, and of the Court they lived;[2] Maximus dropped the Cynic's cloak and stick, and took to silk and gold;[3] spurious Cynics imitated the Emperor's beard and dress, but not his bridled appetite or rigid holiness.[4] None of the Philosophers seem to have taken any active share in their leader's campaign. They accepted priesthoods when they were offered; they accepted as well the emoluments of that office, but they do not appear to have cared much about the duties of the priest. It is significant that the foremost contemporary historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, a soldier and officer of state, was so little attached to his master's faith that from his writings it is all but impossible to say whether he was a pagan or not. There were still those sophists who taught zealously; by the irony of circumstances their most

[1] Augebantur . . . caeremoniarum ritus immodice. Amm. Marc., XXII.12.7.

[2] *βρυάζοντας ἐπὶ τὰ βασίλεια.* Soc., III.1.56.

[3] Jul., *Ep.*, 37.

[4] Cf. Julian, *Or.*, VI., *On False Cynics, passim.*

celebrated pupils were Gregory and Basil, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and John Chrysostom.

The typical men that Julian secured for his sacred offices were like Jeroboam's priests, "of the lowest of the people"; "men who yesterday were dying of hunger, convicts and gaol-birds, men who had difficulty in gaining a livelihood by the most disgraceful measures, became straightway priests and augurs, and found themselves overwhelmed with the highest honours."[1] Julian might well write to the high priest of Galatia, that "Hellenism does not succeed as I reckoned, from the fault of those who profess it."[2] As he made his journey through Asia, he found always the same indifference. The X and the K (Christ and Constantius) were everywhere rampant.[3] It was the same in Constantinople,[4] Cappadocia,[5] Pessinus,[6] Antioch,[7] Berœa,[8] and Alexandria.[9] In the army he was more successful,[10] but it was a

[1] St. Jn. Chrys., *In. Sanctum Baby.*, 14; Cf. Jul., *Epp.*, 4, 49, 62.

[2] *Ep.*, 49.

[3] *Misop.*, 363B.

[4] Soc., III.11.

[5] Jul., *Ep.*, 4.

[6] Jul., *Or.*, V.; *Ep.*, 21.

[7] *Misop. passim.*

[8] Jul., *Ep.*, 27.

[9] See p. 54.

[10] Jul., *Ep.*, 38, 415C. Amm. Marc., XXII.12.6; Greg. Naz., *Or.*, IV.64–66; Soc., III.13.

success of purchase, not of conviction.[1] The soldiers showed their devotion by electing a Christian successor, whilst even in the army there were many dissenters, how many, lack of information makes it impossible to guess.[2]

Julian had failed. There is evidence enough of that, the crowning evidence the stricter administrative policy against Christians, which marked the progress of the army through Asia.[3] The bitterness of the *Misopogon* is the last witness that Julian was leaving what was to him a disenchanted world. He failed because Christianity was too strong, and because his own counter scheme had neither the attractive force, nor the compelling truth, of the system it was to supersede.

§ 6

THE REASON OF THE FAILURE

Julian had attempted an impossible task. He sought to combine into one system everything that was not professedly Christian, elements often wholly irreconcilable, and seldom identical in interest. The union of the

[1] Soz., v.17; Libanius, 578.

[2] See p. 57.

[3] See p. 59.

official state religion with the esoteric personal faith of the Mysteries was in itself a cause large enough to wreck his hopes. The religion of the Mysteries was personal; it required an individual admission, an individual conversion; it was entirely emotional, and quite unsuitable for that reason for general practice. The official religion, on the other hand, was purely formal. The person whose feelings were attracted by the piety and spiritual exaltation of the Mysteries, was the very person who would be repelled by the high and dry formalism of the cult of Rome and Augustus. The simple peasant, to whom the old gods of field and flood were living realities, was equally at a loss to see the spiritual bearing of the philosophic refinements of Neo-Platonism. Contradictory and conflicting elements can grow up in a religion: they cannot, as Julian supposed, be grafted into it.

Certain elements hostile to Christianity were just as abhorrent to Julian himself The teachings of Epicurus and the Sceptics were as offensive to him as the Gospels.[1] For it must be remembered that Julian was not attacking Christianity as a religion, but as an inferior religion. In consequence, much

[1] Jul., *Frag. Ep.*, 300C–301B.

of his scheme serves only to emphasize the supreme worth of Christianity itself.

If the two systems are placed side by side the advantage is all with Christianity; it had all the merits of Julian's scheme, and where Julian was weakest Christianity was strongest —on the historical side. At no time more than at the present day has the great importance of the historical person of the Lord Jesus Christ been realized at its true value. Even anti-Christian writers have emphasized this by seeking to deny the historical existence of Christ altogether; examples of this line of argument are to be found in Mr. J. M. Robertson in England, Dr. W. B. Smith in America, and Dr. Drews in Germany. As Signor Negri puts it, the world needed "an historical God as an image, a representative, a guarantee of the supreme Power that rules the universe."[1] Julian was extremely weak in historical insight, a weakness which he showed in his treatment of the Jews. Indeed the whole principle of his religious reaction may be traced to a lack of historical perspective. Every reactionary who tries to put the clock back is guilty of flouting history and historical development. Nowhere is Julian weaker than when he seeks

[1] op. cit., p. 612.

to substitute for the historical Christ of Christianity, a series of symbols, goblins, and metaphysical phantoms, to which he gives the names of Hercules or Æsculapius, arbitrarily and irrationally.[1]

For so capable a leader of men, Julian showed strange lack of comprehension of human needs. Whilst apparently anxious that even slaves might profess religion,[2] he made no attempt to conciliate the numerous influential women of the empire.[3] The very essence of his scheme was devoid of wide popular appeal. The crowning triumph of Christianity is that it offers something to all conditions of beings; it is founded on the conception of Redemption, that is, on a pessimistic view of the world. It appeals to men, because they do wrong, which is another way of saying, because they are human. The forgiveness of sins and the Resurrection of the dead are the essential ideas of Christianity, and they are the reason of its universal adaptability. Julian, though he was tolerably acquainted with the ritual purification of Mithraism and the Mysteries, interpreted that rite differently from the Christian idea of Redemption. Both Christianity and these

[1] Cf. Jul., *Or.*, VII. 284, *Against the Christians*, p. 198.
[2] Jul., *Ep. to Theodora.* [3] See p. 62.

cults preached Salvation.[1] The pagan view, however, which Julian accepted, was not that of escape from sin, but rather that of illumination, superiority to the ignorance of the world. It was through this assumption of superiority that Julian cut himself off from the common man, by offering him something he could not understand, when he had already in Christianity something which, at least in general outline, was comprehensible to him. The superior person, on the other hand, the person to whom Hellenism as culture might appeal, could not appreciate the theurgy and ritual which made up the greater part of the externals of Julian's religion ; like Ammianus, they could only resent the outrageous increase of ceremonial observances.[2] To these more enlightened, Julian was only reverting to the gloomy shadows of the irrational, and they saw, what Julian himself must have seen, that his austere morality was imposed on his religious structure, and not produced by it.

The failure of the plan may well have been hurried by the fact that it is far from certain that Julian's own convictions were produced by the system he had elaborated. No one would hesitate to say that Julian was religious.

[1] Cheetham, *The Mysteries*, p. 63. [2] Amm. Marc., XXII.12.7.

Communion with God was the secret source of his life. "The gods always deal with me as gentle masters," he says, "as teachers, as fathers."[1] The crises of life always found him on his knees; it was so when he was summoned from Athens to be made Cæsar,[2] and when the soldiers proclaimed him Emperor;[3] it was so, systematically and regularly;[4] with him God was an intuitive and primary assumption.[5]

Whether he derived this faith from the Christianity of his youth, or whether it was the natural bent of his mind, as in the case of most people, it is certain that it was not the fruit of his elaborated scheme of religion. He was naturally religious himself, and he sought to provide a way to such religious experience for other people. Christianity he learnt to hate from extraneous and personal reasons;[6] he tried therefore to find a substitute. The remarkable thing is how little he rejected of the Faith he denied. Historians are apt to explain the temporary recrudescence of paganism as the inevitable result of influences which had been growing since the time of the Alexandrian school.

[1] Jul., *Or.*, VII. 212B. [2] Jul., *Ep. to Ath.*, 275A.
[3] *ibid.*, 284C.
[4] Amm. Marc., XVI.5.5; cf. Jul., *Ep.*, 25.
[5] Jul., *Or.*, VII.209C. [6] See p. 20.

But the personality of Julian is the overwhelming factor in the reaction. As Julian's own scheme cuts a sorry figure by the side of Julian himself, so the best features of Eastern philosophy could scarcely have gained sufficient power of attraction to force a conflict with Christianity, apart from the sincerely religious character of Julian. Much of his teaching had met the infant Church as Gnosticism; it had penetrated Christian doctrine under the romantic influence of Clement and Origen. Not even Julian could take it further. His own scheme of religious reform is important in the history of the Church, more because it shows the strength of Christianity than because it is significant of any power in dying paganism. Its weakness on the historical side emphasizes the strength of the Faith of the historical Christ. Its strength in organization is borrowed from the Church. Its philosophy, though vague and incomplete, is not without the elements of truth; but this very fact only serves to show that the philosophy of a religion is not the most important of its features. The Greek religionists, like Julian, confined their metaphysics to the nature of God. It was not till Augustine arose in the West, with a philosophy of the nature of man and

free will, that metaphysics became part of popular religion. And even so this section of religious thought is subordinate to the central feature of religion—the historical Christ.

§ 7

JULIAN—THE MAN

THERE is a certain element of tragedy in the picture of Julian. A soldier by instinct, he ended his life in one of the greatest failures that ever met the Roman arms. A true servant of God, he embittered his career and sowed a harvest of defeat by his very zeal for religion. He was never the man for the work he attempted. The greatest saint is not the best religious theorist. And Julian was more than usually unfit for the work he attempted. A soldier by nature, he lacked the reasonableness necessary to a religious innovator. He was strangely lacking in knowledge of men; witness his attitude in dealing with the corn supplies in Antioch.[1] He was not gifted with patience; witness his disgust at Constantius' failure to forward

[1] Amm. Marc., XIV.7; Jul., *Misop.*, *passim.*

his schemes of administrative reform in Gaul. His ideals were high; he prays for "a virtuous life, a more perfect understanding, and a superhuman intellect, and a very easy release from the trammels of life at the time appointed; and, after that release, an ascension up to the Divine, and an abiding place with him, if possible, for all time to come."[1] But there was a strain of weakness in his character. Perhaps it was this ineffective element that Chrysanthius saw, when he refused to enter with zest into the religious revival. At times he would disregard the very auspices in which he put his faith.[2] At other times, as in the Persian expedition, he would let his superstition invalidate his generalship. He would not always do what another great fanatic, Cromwell, did—combine the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*. It is characteristic of this strain of weakness that on his elevation to the purple he addressed letters to Athens, Corinth, and Sparta, three towns certainly once famous, but now insignificant even in the East; Sparta in particular being the mere shadow of a name.

Though gifted with no special philosophical

[1] Jul., *Or.*, IV. at the end.
[2] Amm. Marc., XXII.1.2.

leaning, he attempted to draw up a religion based on very intricate and difficult metaphysics. One obscure Oriental inscription describes him as *Filosophiae Magister*—a Master of Philosophy; his own books reveal him only as a sincere, but not profound pupil. His philosophy is difficult not because of its depth, but because of its lack of coherence.

He was a good man, but he was scarcely a great one. Libanius aptly sums him up in saying, "He did not aspire to the possession of power, but to the means of doing good to his states."[1] His administrative measures against Christianity were petty and illiberal. His own religious scheme was barren and academic. With a reticence that emphasized his virtues, and omitted his failings, they wrote on his tomb the verse of Homer:

ἀμφοτερὸν βασιλεύς τ' ἄγαθος κράτερός τ' αἰχμήτης.[2]

[1] Libanius, 534.

[2] *Iliad.*, III.179.

APPENDICES

JULIAN AS ADMINISTRATOR

M. ALLARD very severely calls the reign of Julian Anarchy. As far as his secular government was concerned, this is hardly fair. He was a good ruler spoiled by an ideal. It is this that leads Signor Negri to conclude that he was mentally deranged. As a matter of fact it was his religious fanaticism that kept stultifying his work. Even in his civil administration, he often gave with one hand and took away with the other. The prevailing impression given by the historians is that he was an able and humane ruler. Others echo the verses of Prudentius :

> Conditor et legum celeberrimus ore manuque
> . . . Perfidus ille Deo quamvis non perfidus urbi.[1]

Eutropius sums up his administration in the highest terms.[2] He appears to

[1] Prud., *Ap.*, 450.

[2] In provinciales justissimus, et tributorum quatenus fieri posset repressor, civilis in cunctos, mediocrem trahens aerarii curam. Eutr., x.16.

have acted as emperor in the spirit in which his character is summarized by Ammianus.[1] In Gaul, for example, his fairness of temper would not permit him to remit arrears of taxation, but he resisted the extortionate system of the tax-farmer, and reduced by that method the exactions by some 70 per cent.[2] He repressed similar unfair exactions in Britain,[3] and the corn trade with that country, which was large and badly managed, he placed on a footing satisfactory to all.[4] On the same principle of rectifying abuses, he suspended the privileges of exemption from taxes, and of the use of the public post conferred on the clergy by Constantine.[5] But in that spirit of folly which rightly or wrongly has been interpreted as partisan persecution, immunities and privileges which he took from the Christians, he was apt to confer on the pagan priesthood and on the military. Sozomen says that the pagan priests were immune from taxation.[6] Service in the army and in public civil office brought

[1] Virtute senior aetate studiosus cognitionum omnium, censor moribus regendis acerrimus, placidus opum contemptor, mortalia omnia despiciens.

[2] Amm. Marc., XVI.5.14; XXV.4.15.

[3] Libanius, 552.

[4] *ibid.*

[5] Cf. Soz., V.5.2 and Amm. Marc., XXI.16.18 and Soc., III.1.

[6] Soz., V.3.2.

certain similar immunities and so did a family of thirteen children.[1] The last, one imagines, was a well-deserved privilege which few enjoyed.

When the Emperor entered into the deeper problems of economics, his idealism again led him astray. At Antioch the price of corn had gone up to a fabulous figure owing to the failure of the Syrian harvest. Julian ordered that the price should be fixed at the lowest figure ever known even in the most plentiful years, and imported 422,000 modii for sale. The natural result followed; merchants cornered the market, and sold as they thought fit at ridiculous prices. And the only result Julian attained was a violent quarrel with the people of Antioch, all classes of whom threw the blame, perhaps unjustly, on the Emperor. He failed in this case because he could not judge human nature, he over-estimated it. Again his ideals played him false.

It was the same with the new policy of retrenchment in the Imperial Court. Having cleared Constantinople of the unworthy crowd of unnecessary pensioners who had lived on the bounty of his predecessors, he allowed

[1] Cf. Cod. Theod., VI.27.2; XII.1.56; VI.26.1; XII.1.55.

their places to be filled by pseudo-philosophers and pagan charlatans.[1]

As an administrator of justice, Julian is charged by Gregory Nazianzen with vacillation and instability, revising and altering judgments even at midnight with the variableness of the tides.[2] This may be true, but it was not the result of any unfairness; it was because the Emperor was too fair. Ammianus writes a very striking summary of Julian's administration in the law-courts, when he says that nothing could induce him to deviate from impartiality, not even religious disagreement.[3] He sat to administer law and not justice, and his fairness of mind must often have made him uncertain what was the true verdict to pass.[4] Even the profession of Christianity does not appear to have interfered with a man's right to justice in the courts. Gregory does say[5] that all pleaders were required to offer incense before appearing, and this precluded Christians from frequenting the courts; but this presumably only prevented them from practising law,

[1] Eutrop., x.16. Cf. Soc., III. 1.56—*τοὺς παντάχῃ ἦγεν ἡ φήμη βρυάζοντας ἐπὶ τὰ βασίλεια.*

[2] Greg. Naz., *Or.*, v.20.

[3] Nec argui unquam potuit ob religionem vel quodcunque aliud ab aequitate recto tramite deviasse. Amm. Marc., XXII.10.2.

[4] Cf. Libanius, 584.

[5] *Or.*, IV.97.

not from receiving just treatment in law-suits.

The strain, whether it is to be called doctrinaire or fanatic, which warped the character of Julian as a man, spoiled him as an administrator. He would have been a better emperor had he been a worse man.

A NOTE ON THE AUTHORITIES

THE authorities for the career of Julian both ancient and modern are extremely full; but most of them require to be read with caution. Everyone who writes of Julian is something of a partisan or is accused of being so.

The least biased is Ammianus Marcellinus, a contemporary writing from personal observation. His narrative is cold and formal. Though a pagan he was out of sympathy with Julian's religious revival, and the best he can say of the Emperor's religion is that he was too fond of consulting omens.[1] Religion had apparently no interest for Ammianus, and in consequence he is silent where he might have given valuable information. For this reason Ammianus is a less full authority

[1] Praesagiorum sciscitationi nimiae deditus. Amm. Marc., xxv.4.

for Julian's religious revival than for the other details of his reign.

Julian himself has left a mass of work behind,[1] but this is singularly incomplete. Infinitely more letters have perished than have survived, and the surviving mass has had no benefit of selection; it is the fortuitous survival that chance has permitted. That is a point to notice, because historians are apt to ignore what Julian has not mentioned himself. The work that does exist is the least ingenuous of any of the authorities for the period. Julian was an obscure and vague writer, often concealing his real feelings, and regularly using words without any reference to their accepted meaning. His assertion of facts demands contemporary support, while his interpretation of facts is often wrong, and sometimes deliberately distorted.

Libanius the sophist is far more authoritative as the spokesman of the pagan position. He is less of the public prosecutor than Julian, and more of the historian. It is necessary to discount the natural exaggeration of the rhetorician, but the underlying facts are usually accurate. Not only the Funeral Orations but the letters (especially Nos. 673

[1] The best text is Hertlein (Leipsic). There is a good Eng. trans. in course of publication by W. C. Wright (Loeb series).

and 730) give valuable corroboration to many of the statements of the ecclesiastical historians, which otherwise would have been questioned.

The Christian side has men of much higher character for its partisans. Gregory Nazianzen is by far the best authority, in spite of his unpleasant tone and unabating hostility. No historian incapable of seeing beneath this unsatisfactory surface the purer depths below, can estimate accurately the reign of Julian. The text is in *Migne, P.G.L.*, Vol. 35.

The three Church historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, belong to the next century. They are not contemporary witnesses, and doubts have been cast on their value. They give much information that is otherwise unknown, most of it damaging to the character of the Emperor. His partisans among modern writers have therefore either explicitly or tacitly depreciated their historical value. This is unfair, for Socrates used good sources, among others a complete collection of Julian's letters; Sozomen deliberately sought to supplement the work of Socrates, and Theodoret, writing still later, supplied the colour in the rather prosaic narrative of his predecessors. In no case are their facts to be discredited simply from

lack of corroboration on the pagan side. Who more likely than the Christian historian to collect the facts which pagan would prefer to forget? As there is no smoke without fire, so there must have been facts behind, even if the Church historians have emphasized them too strongly.[1]

Epigraphic evidence is scanty and of no particular interest. At the baths of Spoletum an inscription of the reign of Constantius refers to Julian as *victoriossimus Cæsar;* at Casa in Numidia another calls him *Restaurator libertatis et romanae religionis;* at Thibilis he is called the Restorer of the Sacrifices; an Oriental inscription with unconscious irony describes him as *Filosophiae Magister;* a Greek inscription at Hauran says that "in the reign of Fl. Cl. Julian. imp. aug., the sacrifices have been renewed, and the Temple has been restored in the year 256 (i.e. of the era of Bostra), 5 Dustros." The surviving coins and statues are beside our purpose.

[1] See a discursus on the three Church historians in Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism,* and notes in Prof. Bury's edition of Gibbon. Their relation to each other and their comparative value is a subject that has not been worked out thoroughly.

[illegible] have been noticed
[illegible] the authorities."
[illegible] more or less
[illegible] *Fragmenta Histor-*
[illegible]
[illegible] apparently he
[illegible] Chrysostom
[illegible] have
[illegible]
[illegible]

GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of Roman Empire.* London, 1776.

The best edition is that of Prof. J. B. Bury (1896), seven vols.

The account of Julian in Gibbon is still the best, both for the accuracy of its facts, and the justice of its judgments. It is a striking testimony to the supreme value of Gibbon as an historian, that his unfriendly attitude to Christianity did not prevent him from interpreting the work of Julian, not merely more justly, but more accurately than even a Christian writer. Cf. Cotter Morison's essay in "English Men of Letters" series.

Cambridge Mediæval History, vol. i. Cambridge, 1911.

A concise account of Julian is given in the chapters by Mr. Norman Baynes and the Rev. T. M. Lindsay. Magnificent bibliographies are appended, giving all authorities, ancient and modern, in full detail. A novel chronology is adopted.

BROGLIE, J. V. A. DUC DE, *L'Église et l'Empire au 4ième siècle.* Six vols. Paris, 1856.

SPECIAL WORKS ON JULIAN

JOHNSON, S., *Julian the Apostate.* London, 1682.

WARBURTON, W., *Julian.* London, 1750.

These are mere skits on contemporary English politics. They have no historical bearing on the Emperor Julian.

KING, C. W., *Julian the Emperor.* London, 1888.

A translation of Gregory Nazianzen's two Invectives, Libanius' Apology, and Julian's two essays on the metaphysics of religion, *The Sovereign Sun* and *The Mother of the Gods.* It is published in Bohn's Series with annotations by the translator. It collects some useful material in a handy form.

RENDALL, G. H., *The Emperor Julian.* Cambridge, 1879.

An accurate and scholarly essay. No index.

GARDNER, ALICE, *Julian the Philosopher.* London, 1901.

In the "Heroes of the Nations" series. A pleasing account, rather too friendly to Julian.

ALLARD, P., *Julien l'Apostat,* three vols. Paris, 1906.

The best book on the subject, though possibly too unfriendly. The only work to be put beside Gibbon.

NEGRI, GAETANO, *The Emperor Julian,* Eng. trans., two vols. London, 1905.

A popular attempt, not by a professed historian, to rehabilitate Julian.

WRIGHT, W. C., Text and Eng. translation of Julian's complete writings with some short notes. Loeb series. Two out of three volumes have appeared. London, 1913–14.

Accurate. The notes are illuminating. Friendly to Julian.

SCHWARTZ, G., *De Vita et Scriptis Juliani.* Bonn, 1888.

RODE, F., *Geschischte der Reaktion Kaiser Julian.* Jena, 1879.

MUCKE, J. F. A., *Flavius Claudius Julianus nach den Quellen.* Gotha, 1867.

NEANDER, A., *The Emperor Julian and his Friends.* Eng. trans. by G. V. Cox. London, 1850.

CHINNOCK, E. J. A. Few notes on Julian and a translation of his public Letters. London, 1901.

Julian Against the Christians. Fragments preserved by Cyril. Eng. trans., ed. Willis Nevins. Reprint. London, 1873. Text ed. Neumann, C. J. Leipsic, 1880.

WORDSWORTH, J. Article in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. London, 1877–87.

WORKS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE PERIOD

GLOVER, T. R., *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*. Cambridge, 1901.

An interesting popular account of the literature of the period.

CAPES, W. W., *University Life in Ancient Athens*. London, 1886.

BIGG, C., *Neo-Platonism*. London, 1895.

INGE, W. R., *Philosophy of Plotinus*. London, 1918.

BOISSIER, G., *La Fin du Paganisme*, two vols. Paris, 1903.

MURRAY, G., *Greek Religion*. London, 1913.

BAYNES, N. A paper on *Thou hast conquered, O Galilæan*, read at Historical Congress, 1913.

For a full bibliography, see the *Cambridge Mediæval History*, vol. i.

CHRONOLOGY OF JULIAN

THE chronology of Julian is vague in detail up to the time of his elevation to the Cæsarship. The date of his birth, and the years of his exile at Macellum, offer the chief difficulty. Reference may be made to the chronology in Rendall, *Julian*, and in Allard, *Julien l'Apostat*; also to the *Cambridge Mediæval History*, vol. i., where a rather unusual chronology is adopted.

328–373. Episcopate of Athanasius.

331. (?) Julian born near Constantinople. (The day is given as Nov. 6th by a calendar in Migne, Patrol, XIII. 686. The C.M.H. adopts the novel date April, 332. For a discussion see Rendall and Allard. From Gibbon onwards, 331 is largely accepted.)

337. Death of Constantine.

344. (?) Julian banished to Macellum. (It is possible to fix the banishment in 341, and presume a visit to Constantinople about 348, and a return to Nicomedeia in 349.)

350. Gallus made Cæsar.

351. Julian in Nicomedeia.

351–2. Rejection of Christianity by Julian.

354–5. (Winter.) Julian in seclusion at Milan.

355. Julian in Greece. Initiated into Eleusinian Mysteries.

355. Marriage of Julian and Helena, sister of Constantius.

355. (?) Julian made Cæsar.

355–6. Julian arrived at Vienne.

355–357. The three orations on Eusebia and Constantius.

360. Julian proclaimed Emperor at Paris.

361. Epistles to Senate, Athenians, Spartans, and Corinthians.

361. Nov. 3rd. Death of Constantius.

361. Probable proclamation of Paganism in Constantinople.

362. May 12th. Last law of Julian dated Constantinople.

362. Julian left Constantinople for Antioch.

362–3. Decrees on Education.

362. June 17th. First Education Decree.

362. Second oration against Cynics.

362-3. (Winter.) Oration on King Sun and Work against Christianity.

363. Jan. and Feb. Attempt to build the Temple at Jerusalem.

363. Jan. Julian consul fourth time.

363. Feb. *Misopogon.*

363. March. Latest recorded law of Julian.

363. March 5th. Julian left Antioch.

363. June 26th. Death of Julian.

INDEX

Abraham, 34, 35
Aetius, 39
Africa, 14, 18
Alexandria, 56
Allard, 66, 95, 112
Ammianus Marcellinus, paganism of, 15, 59, 63, 100; Julian's fairness, 42, 113, 115; criticises Julian, 25, 38, 46, 78, 81; religious criticisms, 78, 80, 87, 97, 99, 106; value of his writings, 116
Ammonius, 13
Annunciation, the, 29, 86
Antioch, Christians of, 17 f., 40 f., 53 f.; corn supplies at, 109, 114
Apollinares of Laodicea, 47
Apollinarius, 30
Arianism, struggles of, 15, 52; power and decadence of, 16 f.; failure of, 64; prosaic, 19, 65
Arians, return of, 38
Aristotle, 66, 88
Army, restored to paganism, 40, 57, 61, 101
Artemius, 58
Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, 38, 54 ff.
Athens, 21, 23, 65, 68
Attis, 85, 86 f., 92
Augustine, 14, 47, 108
Aurelian, 68

Babel, story of, 34 f.
Baptism, Julian's, 25, 27 f.; Julian's sneers at, 31
Basil, 101
Basil of Ancyra, 51
Basilina, 21
Bible, the, Julian's criticism of, 30 ff.
Bishops, importance of, 16, 76; deprived of privileges, 39, 41
Britain, 14

Cæsarea, 51
Candidianus of Cappadocia, 15
Capes, 63
Cappadocia, 40
Christianity, strength and weakness of, 15 ff., 19, 62 ff., 78, 79, 108; and paganism compared, 78, 82, 104 ff.
Christians, Julian's vindictiveness against, 38 ff.; persecution of, 49 ff.
Chrysanthius, 110
Clergy, 17, 39, 113
Constans, 13
Constantine, 13, 16, 39, 81
Constantinople, 14, 15, 19, 62
Constantius, 13, 20, 21, 22, 26, 109
Cromwell, 110
Cumont, 42
Curial office, 17, 39
Cyril, Refutation of, 30
Cyril of Heliopolis, 49

Daphne, 53
Dickinson, Lowes, 63
Didymæan oracle, 75
Diogenes, 97
Dionysiac mysteries, 81
Divination, 33, 81
Donatists, 15, 38

Education, 43 ff.
Egypt, 55 f.
Eleusinian mysteries, 68
Eleusius, Bishop of Cyzicus, 52
Epicurus, 74, 103
Epiphany, the, 27, 28, 86
Eusebia, 20
Eusebius of Nicomedeia, 19, 22
Eutropius, 112

Funerals, 42

Gallus, 20, 22, 27
Gardner, Miss, 27, 48, 63, 96
Gaul, 14
George of Cappadocia, 56 f.
Gibbon, 26, 36, 38, 42, 48

Gnosticism, 108
Gregory Nazianzen, early training, 101; opinion of Julian, 21, 80, 115; Julian's rejection of Christianity, 28; Julian's Christian persecution, 37 f., 40, 42, 62; religious apathy of Julian's day, 15; value of his writings, 59 f., 118

Harnack, 96
Hecebolius, 23, 47, 61
Helios, 26, 90, 92 f., 96
Hellenism, church of, identified with paganism, 63, 68; Julian's conversion to, 65 ff.; Julian's scheme of, 70 ff.; attempt to create historical basis, 79 ff., 104; metaphysical basis, 20, 87 ff.; failure of, 63, 79, 98 ff., 102 ff.
Homer, 77, 80, 87, 111
Homoousion, 64
Hügel, Baron von, 69

Iamblichus, 13, 25, 66, 88
Incense, 42, 58, 115

Jerome, 30, 37
Jesus Christ, 31 ff., 56; the historical Christ, 79, 104, 108 f.
John Chrysostom, 101
Julian, nomination as Cæsar, 20, 68, 107; proclaimed Emperor, 27, 107; character, 21, 98, 109 ff.; education, 22 ff.; religious, 25, 67, 81, 95, 106 ff.; relations with Christianity, 27 ff.; his apostasy, 14, 19 ff., 26; was he baptized, 25, 27 f.; policy of pagan preference, 37 ff., 69; East chosen for pagan revival, 18, 98 f.; educational policy, 43 ff.; failure of his schemes, 18, 60 ff., 79, 102 f.; a mystic, 25, 29 f., 65, 80, 87, 93 f.; his theology, 87 ff., 93 ff., 105 ff.; as administrator, 112; his two treatises, 67; his letters, 59, 117; "Misopogon," 17, 21, 54, 61, 102; book against the Christians, 30 ff.; death, 49, 95, 109; authorities for, 116 ff.
Julian, Count, 54, 57, 61
Justice, Courts of, 16, 42, 115
Justin Martyr, 35

Labarum, 40, 57
Lampadius, 16
Lampsacus, 64
Libanius, 20, 25, 45, 66; Julian's character, 21, 111: influence on Julian, 23; Julian's anti-Christian policy, 37 f.; wreck of pagan movement, 62; value of his writings, 59 f., 117
Logos, 90, 92 f.
Lustral water, 41, 57

Macellum, 22, 23
Marcus Aurelius, 67, 80
Mardonius, 22, 65
Maris, Bishop of Chalcedon, 62
Mark, Bishop of Arethusa, 50
Maximin Daza, 70, 72
Maximus of Ephesus, 24, 25, 27, 66 f., 81, 100
Mithraism, 13; resemblance to Christianity, 35, 105 f.; Julian and, 42, 68, 81, 82, 88, 105 f.; immorality of, 13, 96 f.
Monasteries, 77
Mother, the Great, 29, 85, 86, 97
Mucke, J. F. A., 14
Musonius, 47
Mysteries, the Greek, 16, 79, 96 f., 103, 105 f.
Mythology, Julian's, 68, 83 ff., 105

Napoleon, 68
Neander, 41
Negri, 56, 104, 112
Neo-Platonism, 12 f.; Julian and, 24 f., 66, 79, 88 f., 94, 96 f.
Newman, 95
Nicene theology, 19
Nicocles, 23
Nicomedeia, 22, 23, 25, 65, 68

Olybrius, 16

Paganism, strength of, 12 ff.; weakness of, 15, 71, 78; wreck of, 62; the faith of the villagers, 11 f., 103
Pegasius, 61
Petronius Probus, 16
Philip of Side, 30
Photinus, 39
Plato, 66, 89
Platonism, 16, 65, 88 f.
Plotinus, 88 f.
Pompey, 12
Pontifex Maximus, 70 ff.
Poor Relief, 76
Porphyry, 13, 30, 66
Priests of ch. of Hellenism, 72 ff., 101, 113
Proæresius, 47
Prudentius, 68, 112

Relics destroyed, 40, 52

39

Rendall, 46
Rode, F., 19
Rome, 14

St. John, 92
St. Paul, 74, 76
Sallustius, 26, 28, 53
Simon, Jules, 66
Socrates, 41, 60, 118
Sol Invictus, 29, 68, 86
Sozomen, Julian's anti-Christian policy, 28, 37, 50, 51, 77, 113; value of his writings, 60, 118
Spain, 18
Spiritualists, 24
Stoicism, 88 f.
Sun, 56, 83 ff., 90 f., 97. *See also* Helios and Sol Invictus

Taurobolium, 28
Taxation, 113 f.
Tertullian, 35
Theodore, 53 f.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 30, 101
Theodoret, 41, 58, 60, 118
Theodosian Code, 11, 14, 16, 17, 43 f., 114
Theosophy, 93 f.
Titus, Bishop of Bostra, 52
Trinity, the, 93

Valentinian, 11, 57
Valentinians, 52
Victorinus, 47
Virgins, holy, 49

Women, influence of, 17, 62, 105; as priestesses, 73, 77

PRINTED BY WM. BRENDON AND SON, LTD.
PLYMOUTH, ENGLAND

72 241HY C 55 I 3790

3 2044 011 553 682

A FINE IS INCURRED IF THIS BOOK IS

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

*Non-receipt of overdue notices does **not** exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

Harvard College Widener Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-2413

WIDENER
MAY 2 8 2002
BOOK DUE

Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve library collections at Harvard.